

THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
REVIEW

*BOARD OF EDITORS*

CARL BECKER

ARCHIBALD C. COOLIDGE

GUY S. FORD

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE

WILLISTON WALKER

*MANAGING EDITOR*

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XXVI

OCTOBER 1920 TO JULY 1921

LIBRARY  
COAST ARTILLERY  
SCHOOL

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1921

PRESS OF  
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY  
LANCASTER, PA.

YH98ELJ  
YH11TRÄ TBA00  
J00H02

30745

A2245

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVI

## NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1920

## ARTICLES

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON	The American Historical Review, 1895-1920 . . .	1
ROBERT L. SCHUYLER	The Recall of the Legions: a Phase of the Decentralization of the British Empire	18
SIDNEY B. FAY	New Light on the Origins of the World War, II. . .	37
FREDERIC L. PAXSON	The American War Government, 1917-1918 . . .	54
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		77
HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .		154

## NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1921

## ARTICLES

EDWARD CHANNING	An Historical Retrospect . . .	191
MIKHAIL ROSTOVTSSEV	South Russia in the Prehistoric and Classical Period . . .	203
SIDNEY B. FAY	New Light on the Origins of the World War, III. . .	225
L. M. SEARS	A Confederate Diplomat at the Court of Napoleon III. . .	255
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS		
THEODORE C. PEASE	A Caution regarding Military Documents . . .	282
DOCUMENTS—Gen. M. C. Meigs on the Conduct of the Civil War . . .		285
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		304
HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .		374

## NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1921

## ARTICLES

	The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Washington . . .	413
FREDERIC DUNCALF	The Peasants' Crusade . . .	440
FRANK A. GOLDER	The American Civil War through the Eyes of a Russian Diplomat . . .	454
ROSS H. MCLEAN	Troop Movements on the American Railroads during the Great War . . .	464
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS		
CARL R. FISH	The German Indemnity and the South . . .	489
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		491
HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .		600

(iii)

NOV 2 1921

## NUMBER 4. JULY, 1921

## ARTICLES

CARL BECKER	Mr. Wells and the New History . . . . .	641
JOHN R. KNIPPING	German Historians and Macedonian Imperialism . . . . .	657
VISCOUNT BRYCE	The Life of Disraeli, V., VI.	672
PERCY W. BIDWELL	The Agricultural Revolution in New England . . . . .	683
KENNETH S. LATOURETTE	Chinese Historical Studies during the Past Seven Years	703
WALTER T. SWINGLE	Chinese Historical Sources . . . . .	717

DOCUMENT—Journal of a French Traveller in the Colonies, 1765, part I. . . . .	726
---	-----

REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .	748
----------------------------	-----

HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .	846
---------------------------	-----

INDEX . . . . .	883
-----------------	-----



The  
**American Historical Review**

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, 1895-1920

WHEN a notable American university was celebrating with just pride its first decennial anniversary, a "candid friend" who was present, from an "allied or associated" nation not here to be specified, remarked with austere pleasantry that "when one of our institutions is only ten years old, we try to conceal the fact". Twenty-five years may be—it is permissible to the editor to hope that it will prove to be—relatively a short period in the life of the *American Historical Review*, but, after all, twenty-five years is nearly a generation of human life, and its completion, by an institution however modest in scope, may well warrant some sort of commemoration. Most of those who now take (and we hope read) our journal are too young to remember the earlier part of its history; and moreover, there are features of the story of its origin that may interest the student of the history of scholarly enterprises in general.

America had not been wholly without historical journals in earlier times than the year 1895. Besides the organs of local historical societies, we had from 1857 to 1875 the *Historical Magazine*, edited during most of its career by Henry B. Dawson, a robust political partisan, stoutly polemical; and the centennial year 1876 had brought into existence the *Magazine of American History*, edited successively by John Austin Stevens, jr., the Reverend Dr. B. F. De Costa, and Mrs. Martha J. Lamb. Useful magazines they were, but they belonged to and represented a period when the little military engagements of the Revolutionary War, the biographies of its heroes and of the "Fathers" in general, the minutiae of voyages and discoveries, endlessly disputable, and the local and antiquarian details of the colonial period, were regarded as the main matters of American history, and those were the subjects with which their pages were filled; also they were confined to American history. By

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—I. (1)

1895, however, the study of history in the United States had passed into a more advanced stage of development. It had become less provincial, less contracted in view. Its chief motive powers had passed from the hands of elderly antiquarians into those of young teachers. Where in 1857 there had been a dozen college teachers of history in the country, in 1895 there were nearly or quite a hundred, and nearly half of them had studied in German universities. In those days, before the French universities had developed their superior excellences, Germany was the Mecca of the ambitious American historical student, and the German seminary the place where his mind came into fructifying contact with the historical scholarship of the world at large.

To such minds the rôle of scientific journals in the development and maintenance of their study was familiar. They were readers of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, which Ranke and others had established in 1859, and of the *Revue Historique*, founded by Monod in 1876, which most of them probably regarded as the best model of what an historical journal should be. It was certain that, as soon as the historical profession in the United States had attained a certain number, and a certain stage of importance and influence in the academic world, its members would wish to establish a periodical organ of American historical scholarship. No doubt a considerable impulse in that direction came from the foundation of the *English Historical Review*, whose initial number (January, 1886), with Lord Acton's famous article, made so brilliant a beginning. That impulse was probably strengthened among us by the visits paid to various American universities, later in that year, by the first editor of that journal, Dr. Mandell Creighton, afterward bishop of Peterborough and of London, who came to America as representative of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, at the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of Harvard University. The present writer, at least, remembers well that from the time of his brief talk with Dr. Creighton the desire to see America provided with a scientific historical journal of her own, and to help if possible in its establishment, was often in his thoughts, and he presumes the same to have been true of others. At all events, the notion was in the air.

In the actual genesis of the *Review*, there was an element of fortunate coincidence—coincidence made fortunate by the amiable disinterestedness which characterizes the historical profession in this country and which, we may presume, springs naturally from the historian's habit of looking at all sides of questions in his field. At that time each of the subjects most nearly allied to history had one

or more professional journals in the United States. Nearly all of them were the peculiar property of individual universities, and were sustained by that loyal zeal for the individual university which is at times so great a help and at times so great a hindrance to the best progress of learning in America. Excellent as these journals were, they would have been the better for having a broader basis and drawing their material from a wider circle of contributors. If in such a subject as political economy, in which radical differences of opinion and tendency play an important part, there is an advantage in having different journals that represent the different schools of doctrine prevalent at various universities, in history, on the other hand, as history is pursued in North America, such differences of doctrine have no corresponding degree of significance, and, however journals of history might multiply in the future, it was fortunate that the first scientific American historical journal should not be in any sense the organ of a single institution, but should be founded, on as broad a basis as possible, in the good will of the whole profession.

It is possible that historical faculties in several American universities were in 1894 contemplating the foundation of historical journals; what is certain is that three such plans were coming to something like maturity in the closing months of that year, at Harvard, Cornell, and the University of Pennsylvania. Their development was so nearly simultaneous that no stress was ever subsequently laid on questions of priority. The plan which was developing at Harvard was based from the beginning on the thought of extensive co-operation, in the management of the journal, on the part of historical scholars in other universities. The Cornell plan was framed by Professor Henry Morse Stephens, who in that autumn had come to Ithaca from England. Besides his well-known learning and his gifts as a teacher, he had had much experience in journalistic reviewing and some share in the first years' work of the *English Historical Review*. Late in November he proposed to the trustees of Cornell University a project for an historical journal, of which he should be editor-in-chief, and in the conduct of which Professors Moses Coit Tyler and George L. Burr should be associated with him. It was, by the first intention, to be distinctly a possession of Cornell University, but the aid and support of the historical profession in general were of course and with reason expected.

During that same autumn of 1894 while the Cornell professor of history was shaping his plans, the faculty of history in Har-

vard University, which at that time consisted of Professors Emerson, Gross, Macvane, Channing, and Hart, and in a less technical sense included Justin Winsor and Professor W. J. Ashley, were engaged in plans of a similar nature, but providing on a much broader basis for co-operation on the part of historical faculties in other institutions. It does not appear that either project was known to the framers of the other until the meeting of the American Historical Association in the closing days of December, 1894. At that time there were some private conversations on the subject, but not such as would spread definite knowledge or would necessarily check the separate maturing of the two projects. It happened, however, that both Mr. Stephens and Mr. Emerton, very naturally, during the course of that session consulted Professor George B. Adams of Yale respecting their plans. Strongly impressed, as indeed was Professor Emerton, with the desirability of having one historical journal, supported by all the strength that the historical scholars of the country could supply, rather than two competing journals less completely representative, Mr. Adams on the last day of the year wrote to both informants, in terms intended to bring about a union of forces. At Harvard the effect of his representations was to cause a suspension of plans until a formal conference, representative of various universities and scholars, could be had. To Cornell he had suggested that the project there formed might be widened to include such representatives in the capacity of associate editors, while still, in recognition of the generous pecuniary provisions made by the trustees of Cornell University, Mr. Stephens should be editor-in-chief.

On February 11, 1895, Professor Stephens formally submitted to the executive committee of the Cornell trustees a project embodying these modifications of his original plan. On the next day the executive committee adopted this project, made liberal provisions for the initial expenses of the review and for its subsequent maintenance, and voted an increase of Professor Stephens's salary. A circular letter dated February 17, and signed by Professors Tyler, Burr, and Stephens, was sent to about a dozen historical scholars in different parts of the country, outlining the plan and inviting the recipients to act as associate editors assisting Professor Stephens and his Cornell colleagues. Meanwhile, however, on January 28, the Harvard professors had sent invitations to a larger number of scholars, in various places, asking them to come to a conference in Cambridge at Easter, to consider the foundation, on some co-operative plan, of an American Historical Review. Not unnaturally, it so happened that Professor Adams and at least three others of those

to whom these invitations went were also among the dozen who, a few days later, received the invitations from Cornell, and all these three, each on his own motion, wrote immediately to both parties, in the same sense in which Mr. Adams had written at an earlier stage, urging the advantages of a combination of forces.

Forthwith Professor Stephens, at the instance of the Cornell group, journeyed to Boston, to Providence, and to New Haven, everywhere seeking the means of harmonizing the Cornell plan with the desire so widely expressed for a single journal, with a truly national basis. As a result of these consultations and of ensuing correspondence it was agreed that both plans, and the whole matter of the journal, should be laid before a general conference of those interested, to be held at New York on April 6. The call, which was dated March 20, went out over six representative signatures, those of Professors Emerton, Tyler, and Adams, Professor (later President) H. P. Judson of Chicago, Professor McMaster of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Sloane of Princeton (afterward of Columbia University). Those invited were mostly professors of history in the leading universities and colleges. By the time the conference took place, the Cornell authorities were disposed to waive all the provisions that had accompanied their subvention, except the proviso that the editor-in-chief should be a Cornell professor. Morse Stephens personally had declared that if a co-operative plan was adopted and the Cornell plan rejected he would do all he could to persuade Cornell to withdraw from the field and would offer to surrender that portion of his salary which had been granted in view of the editorial work. Though the liberality of his trustees made it unnecessary for him to carry out this generous sacrifice, it is only just to add, by a little anticipation, that he cheerfully surrendered the post of editor-in-chief for which he had been designated, and throughout the initial years of the *Review* did yeoman service of much value in the Board of Editors.

The conference of April 6, 1895, held in the rooms of the Reform Club in New York City, was attended by twenty-six persons, of whom seventeen are still living. The twenty-six were: Mr. Charles Francis Adams,<sup>1</sup> Professors George B. Adams of Yale and Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr, Dr. Frederic Bancroft, Professor Edward G. Bourne<sup>1</sup> of Western Reserve University (professor-elect in Yale), Professors John W. Burgess of Columbia, Edward P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania, and William A. Dunning of Columbia, Mr. Paul L. Ford,<sup>1</sup> Professor Herbert D.

<sup>1</sup> Since deceased.

Foster of Dartmouth, Dr. Herbert Friedenwald of Philadelphia, Professors Charles Gross<sup>1</sup> and Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard, J. F. Jameson of Brown University, McMaster of Pennsylvania, Edwin K. Mitchell of Hartford Theological Seminary, Dana C. Munro of Pennsylvania, Herbert L. Osgood<sup>1</sup> of Columbia, and James H. Robinson of Pennsylvania, Mr. John C. Ropes,<sup>1</sup> Professors Lucy M. Salmon of Vassar, Sloane of Princeton, and Stephens<sup>1</sup> of Cornell, Dr. Charles J. Stillé<sup>1</sup> of Philadelphia, Professors Tyler<sup>1</sup> of Cornell and George M. Wrong of Toronto.

In this conference, by unanimous agreement, the main outlines of an organization for the proposed review were settled. To meet expenses, except in so far as they might be assumed by a publisher, it was resolved that an association of guarantors should be formed, guaranteeing in the aggregate two thousand dollars per annum for two years, and, if needed, for a third year, after which it was hoped that the *Review* would be self-supporting. It was also resolved that the conference should elect an editorial board of five members, which should select a managing editor and, for a term of one year, serve as an executive committee, in charge of the new undertaking. Professors Adams, Hart, McMaster, Sloane, and Stephens were elected as the first Board of Editors. In order that the West, hardly at all represented in the conference, might have a representative in the Board, Professor Judson of Chicago was presently added to this group.<sup>2</sup> The Board elected as its chairman Professor Adams, as its secretary and treasurer Professor Hart; and to these two, throughout all its earlier years, the *Review* was signally indebted for invaluable services, especially in all business matters. A managing editor (the writer of these pages, managing editor 1895-1901, 1905-1920) was chosen to serve as executive officer under this board of six. It was resolved by the Board that the first number of the new quarterly should appear on the first of October. Arrangements were presently made with the Macmillan Company of New York as publishers. It is a pleasure to bear testimony in this place to the uniformly happy relations which during twenty-five years have subsisted between these publishers and the editors, to the kindness and consideration with which, especially in the

<sup>2</sup> The list of members of the Board from the beginning to the present time runs as follows: George B. Adams, 1895-1912; Albert B. Hart, 1895-1909; Harry P. Judson, 1895-1902; John B. McMaster, 1895-1898; William M. Sloane, 1895-1911; H. Morse Stephens, 1895-1905; Andrew C. McLaughlin, 1898-1914; J. Franklin Jameson, 1902—; George L. Burr, 1905-1915; Frederick J. Turner, 1909-1915; James H. Robinson, 1911—; Edward P. Cheyney, 1912—; Carl Becker, 1914—; Ephraim Emerton, 1915-1917; Claude H. Van Tyne, 1915—; Charles H. Haskins, 1917-1919; Williston Walker, 1920—.

earlier years, the president of the company, Mr. George P. Brett, placed his experience and sagacity at the service of the Board, and to the perfect delicacy with which the publishers have abstained from every effort to use the pages of the *Review* in the interest of any of their other publications. Never in twenty-five years has any suggestion come from them as to how any "Macmillan book" should be treated in the pages devoted to reviews, while in all pecuniary matters their course has been so generous that, if the *Review* has been of service to the cause of history, a large share of the thanks belongs to the Macmillan Company.

It is a pleasure also to record the gratitude of the editors to the New Era Printing Company of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who since the second year have been the printers of the *Review*, and in all the many details involved in that function have constantly rendered it faithful, intelligent, and efficient service.

During the next months of 1895 the Board of Editors had a twofold labor to perform, that of securing guarantors in order that the *Review* might be possible and that of securing for its earlier numbers such contributions that it might be creditable. For the former purpose, members of the Board and of the organizing conference canvassed their friends and their university circles. The Harvard and Yale constituencies stood foremost in the amount of subscriptions; other institutions in which groups of guarantors were found were Cornell, Chicago, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, that of Toronto, and the Hartford Theological Seminary. The second recorded subscriber to the fund was Theodore Roosevelt, and one of the earliest was John Hay. So, in sums of from five to fifty-five dollars each, more than three hundred persons assured the new journal of an annual fund of more than \$3600 per annum for a period of three years. A meeting of the Association of Guarantors was held in December, 1895, at which the same editors were formally elected by that body, for terms so arranged as to expire in from one to six years, a six-year term being established as normal. To this meeting the treasurer of the Board submitted his accounts. Similar meetings were held in December of 1896 and 1897. Meanwhile, the Board of Editors had been having three or four meetings in each of these years, and in subsequent years it has been its practice to have three meetings yearly, meetings of great value to the conduct of the journal. Many scientific reviews have merely nominal boards, composed of distinguished members who only lend their names, but ours has been a real board of editors, directing the managing editor in the earlier years, advising and



counselling with him since the date (1901) when a member of the Board became managing editor.

As to the contents of the *Review*, it was intended that, as in most historical journals, they should consist of four sorts and should be organized in four divisions: "body articles", documents heretofore unpublished, reviews of books, and items of news respecting either the historical profession or new publications or developments in the field of history, European or American—for the title *American Historical Review* never implied confinement to the history of America, nor any other emphasis upon it than what the natural flow of contributions might bring.

Concerning articles, the preliminary circular put forth by the Board of Editors said, "the three criteria for contributions to the *Review* are: that they shall be fresh and original in treatment; that they shall be the result of accurate scholarship; and that they shall have distinct literary merit. Articles which fulfill these conditions will be welcomed on any field of history." Laudable desires, still entertained! though at the end of twenty-five years the editors would be obliged to confess, somewhat ruefully, that not everything they have printed has conformed to all these standards. A stream cannot rise higher than its source; with our best endeavors, the level our journal can attain is in some degree conditioned by the actual facts of a world, a country, and a profession in which not everyone who has something to say can say it well. In Parliament there are "papers by command"; an historical review, even though many papers are based on editorial request or suggestion, cannot always command all the excellences its ideals might require.

Neither in respect to articles solicited, nor in their selection from among articles offered, nor in respect to the reviewing of books, have the editors ever sought, either by choice of subject or by suggestions as to treatment, to favor any particular school or to sustain any doctrinal tendency in American historical work. They have wished their journal to be the organ of no circle less extensive than the whole American historical profession. They have desired to be hospitable to every variety of historical thought that is at all current among the members of that profession, and have had no "policy" but, while maintaining high standards of method and of scholarship, to be catholic in matters of opinion. If it has so happened that all the editors have been professors, and if the tone of the journal has been distinctly academic, those limitations have their explanation. A professor in an important university hears of more of the good work that is going on than comes to the knowledge of one less cen-



trally placed. Moreover, though we ought to guard against the characteristic weaknesses and defects of academics, it remains true that far the greatest part of America's historical production springs from academic circles. More than three-fourths of the members of the American Historical Association are teachers; and the number of Americans who with their own means and without academic connection were or are working in history was unfortunately small in 1895 and is, in proportion, even smaller in 1920.

The salutatory article of the new journal was a paper on "History and Democracy", by Professor Sloane, of the Board of Editors, who set forth with his customary breadth of view and eloquence the gains which the history of society owed to the modern developments of adjoining sciences, the need of sound historical knowledge for the conduct of a democratic government, and the encouragement which our conservative spirit, our varied European origins, and our cultivation of history in the past might lend to the expectation that American democracy would be favorable to the development of historical work among us, and that that work would be marked not only by solid merits but even by literary excellence. For articles of substantive history for their first number the editors made their best endeavors in many quarters. They secured from M. C. Tyler a valuable and most attractive article on the Party of the Loyalists in the American Revolution, and from Professor F. J. Turner one on Western State-Making during the Revolutionary Era. John Fiske was prevented from assisting, by exclusive contracts which he had made with his publishers; von Holst, by failing health. Henry C. Lea gave to the first number a bit on the First Castilian Inquisitor, and a more important article to the second number. Henry Adams gave to the first number a chip from his workshop, slight but entertaining, on Count Edward de Crillon. Pressed for a further contribution, he replied in characteristic fashion:

Long absences are one cause which has broken my relations with the world. The other and more serious cause is that, in the chaotic and unintelligible condition in which I found—and left—the field of knowledge which is called History, I became overpoweringly conscious that any further pretence on my part of acting as instructor would be something worse than humbug, unless I could clear my mind in regard to what I wanted to teach. As History stands, it is a sort of Chinese Play, without end and without lesson. With these impressions I wrote the last line of my History, asking for a round century before going further. . . . I have nothing to say. I would much rather wipe out all I have ever said, than go on with more. I am glad to hear other men if they think they have something worth saying; but it is as a scholar, and not as a teacher, that I have taken my seat.

The old files of correspondence from those early days bring back pleasant recollections of many historical students of the older generation who helped the new journal on many occasions and with cordial good-will, and whose generous encouragement is remembered with affectionate gratitude—Charles Francis Adams and Daniel H. Chamberlain, Jacob D. Cox and George W. Julian, Admiral Mahan, that “*veray parfit gentil knight*”, John C. Ropes and James Schouler, Edward M. Shepard and Justin Winsor. Are there public men now who take the same interest in history as did these men of Civil War times? The old letters bring up too the memory of younger men now gone, colleagues like Edward Bourne or Charles Gross, who could be relied on for constant aid and sympathetic counsel; or Paul Ford, with his wonderful resources of knowledge, or the sagacious Herbert Adams; and grateful remembrance of the many friends of the new journal who are happily still living. Especially interesting are the many messages of congratulation upon the first number, for they show plainly how pleased were our scattered workers in history to find themselves so numerous and capable of co-operative effort so large and varied.

The pieces printed under the rubric “Documents” in this first number had not the same importance as some that have since been published, but at least one has always the satisfaction of feeling, with respect to this section, that what value its contents may have is permanent. Articles may be superseded, reviews of books serve in the main a temporary purpose, but original materials usually retain their value unimpaired. What one would like best would be to print, quarter after quarter, a series of documents found in private hands or houses, and so exposed to destruction—brands rescued from the burning—yet of such a character as to revolutionize important chapters of history; but this is too much to expect. We may be content in twenty-five years if we have made, whether from private repositories or from public archives, a good many helpful additions to the documentary material for history, chiefly, of course, American history.

In the earlier volumes there was a rubric for bibliographies of a certain sort, lists of original materials mostly, but this was before long abandoned. In the twentieth volume, on the other hand, the practice was begun of reserving a special place, with the heading “Notes and Suggestions”, for minor contributions, fruits of research having a limited scope and yet a certain importance. In European historical journals such by-products of the historian’s trade abound; in our case, though the notes actually sent in have

been good, the supply has for some reason never been as abundant as had been expected.

Of all the contents of the first number, it was perhaps the reviews of books on which the editors bestowed most thought and from which they derived most satisfaction. The difficulties were not inconsiderable, in the case of a journal which had as yet no established position, and which had to encounter the then formidable competition of the *Nation*; but books were obtained, through a range sufficient to justify the claim to catholicity which Professor Sloane's salutatory had announced, and the desired reviewers were cordially willing to help. A series of reviews which included notices of Hodgkin's *Italy and Her Invaders* by Professor Emerton, of Pollock and Maitland's *History of English Law* by Professor Melville M. Bigelow, of Seebohm's *Tribal System in Wales* by Professor C. M. Andrews, of Fitzmaurice's *Life of Sir William Petty* by W. J. Ashley, of Lord Wolseley's *Napoleon* and Lord Roberts's *Wellington* by Colonel Theodore Dodge, of Lavisse's *Victor Duruy* by John Bigelow, of *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* by Herbert Adams, of Thayer's *Cases on Constitutional Law* by Judge Simeon Baldwin, of Withers's *Chronicles of Border Warfare* (ed. Thwaites) by Theodore Roosevelt, of Bigelow's *Tilden* by Edward M. Shepard, and of Prowse's *Newfoundland* by Goldwin Smith, certainly did not lack distinction.

In twenty-five years, more than four thousand books have been reviewed. It has been the intention of the editors to include among them all the important historical volumes published in the United States, and the most important of those that have appeared in European countries, but their success in obtaining the latter from the European publishers has naturally been less complete. It has been their desire that the books described and appraised should represent all fields and varieties of history—not political history alone, but also ecclesiastical, legal, military, naval, economic, social, and cultural history, and the general history of science and of literature. There were not wanting in 1895, perhaps there are not wanting now, those to whom such an inclusiveness appeared strange. A friendly reviewer of the first number mentioned with mild surprise that a review of Briggs's *The Messiah of the Apostles* had "somehow strayed in", as if the chief personage of history were no concern of history properly speaking, because his story could be labelled ecclesiastical history and so relegated to the exclusive care of ecclesiastics and their journals, or as if the empire of history could be profitted by creating as many independent satrapies as possible and refusing

to meddle in any territory but such as no one else desired. If any of the readers of our journal have preferred a narrower view, the editors cherish the modest hope that they have done them a little good, by compelling them occasionally to look over their fences.

If there is anything in the conduct of the journal, in this or in other departments, that the editors would wish to emphasize, it is that the *American Historical Review* has always been edited primarily in the interest of its readers; indeed, it may fairly be said that the readers' interests have solely been regarded, except in cases where, such considerations standing equal, other interests could legitimately be taken into account. Thus, in the selection of reviewers, it is not the author, still less the publisher, whose interests have been considered, but those of the reader. For his benefit we have sought the aid of the reviewer most qualified in respect to knowledge, judgment, and fairness of mind. Men's books have not been reviewed by their colleagues and friends—neither by their enemies, but the "history man" usually has none—not that friend or colleague or enemy might not judge his book fairly, but readers might not think so. (Says Confucius, "Under an apple-tree adjust not your hat; in a cucumber-patch tie not your shoe.") It is a pleasant reward for the pains expended on these details that, so far as is remembered, no one has ever accused the *Review* of log-rolling or the opposite vice—except once the publisher of a very bad text-book.

Text-books are a special variety, and require a special treatment. Some have thought it beneath the dignity of an historical quarterly of the three-decker class to concern itself with these freight-carrying merchantmen. In the minds of the editors, however, the controlling consideration was that historical books of this sort are more used than any others, that a large portion of our readers are text-book-using teachers, and that it is particularly hard to obtain disinterested judgments respecting such volumes. There is a fierce light that doth beat upon a text-book. For several years the device employed by the *Review* was to retain a special group of five men, good teachers and good scholars, one in ancient history, one in medieval, one in modern, one in English, and one in American history, no one of whom had himself written a text-book or was likely to do so, but each of whom was a good judge of that genus, and to entrust to him all text-books that came in from his particular field. Fairer and more comparable judgments, based on more uniform standards, were thus secured; but after the establishment of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, with its admirable arrangements for

securing competent and disinterested reviews of text-books, it seemed best to resign that whole class of volumes, with a few exceptions, to that excellent journal.

Of reviews in general, what the editors have hoped for has been indicated in a circular which they have sent to all reviewers:

It is desired that the review of a book shall be such as will convey to the reader a clear and comprehensive notion of its nature, of its contents, of its merits, of its place in the literature of the subject, and of the amount of its positive contribution to knowledge. . . . It is hoped that the reviewer will take pains, first of all, to apprehend the author's conception of the nature and intent of his book and to criticize it with a due regard to its species and purpose. It should, however, be remembered that the review is intended for the information and assistance of readers, and not for the satisfaction of the author of the book. Sympathy, courtesy, a sense of attachment, readiness to make allowance for a different point of view, should not therefore withhold the reviewer from the straightforward expression of adverse judgment sincerely entertained; otherwise the Review cannot fulfill the important function of upholding a high standard of historical writing.

Whatever general suggestions might thus be laid before reviewers, the quality of the reviews, year after year, must perforce be what the reviewers make it. The managing editor can seldom be justified in asking them to modify what they have written, never in substituting his judgment for that of an expert whom he has selected as the best appraiser. If an author considers his reviewer's criticisms ill-founded, he has full liberty to reply, provided his response is confined to matters of fact, capable of being settled one way or the other, as distinguished from matters of opinion, on which author and reviewer might differ endlessly and without result. Probably our reviews have been on the average too lenient. Left free to sign or not to sign, most of our reviewers sign their reviews, and it is an uncomfortable thing to speak ill of a man's book when at the next Christmas season of peace on earth you are going to meet him at the meeting of the American Historical Association. Is it not perceptible that we "let ourselves go" a little more when we are reviewing the book of an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a German? No one wishes to see revived that "slashing" variety of review which delighted our grandfathers, or to emulate the controversial manners of the Germans;<sup>3</sup> but, as the circular indicates, if standards are to be maintained, reviewers must speak their minds, "without fear, favor, affection, or hope of reward".

Of the final section of the *Review's* contents, that devoted to

<sup>3</sup> Or ought one, now that warfare is ended, to be *Tacitus de moribus Germanorum*?

items of historical news, it is sufficient to say that, while in the first six volumes all were written by the managing editor, in the next four volumes those relating to European history were kindly supplied by Professor Earle W. Dow of Michigan, in the next three or four by Dr. Frances G. Davenport of the Carnegie Institution of Washington; for a number of years past, the majority of the American items have been provided by Dr. Edmund C. Burnett of the same institution, the greater number of the European by Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University.

Let us now return to the external history of the *Review*. Before the issue of the second number, there were, including the guarantors, 850 subscribers. Two years later there were a thousand. At that time, that is to say, in November and December, 1897, the guaranties having expired without the journal's becoming self-supporting, the Board of Editors began negotiations with the American Historical Association, with a view to aid. The Association had up to that time had no connection with the *Review*. Of the 324 guarantors, 144 were members of the Association when they made their guaranties, 180 were not. Of the thousand subscribers to the journal in the autumn of 1897, there were 850 who were not members of the Association and 150 who were members of it, while of the 800 members of the Association there were 650 who were not subscribers to the *Review*. The leading members of the Association's Executive Council at that time were reluctant to assume any financial responsibility for the journal, yet the logic of the situation and a due consideration of the objects which both institutions proclaimed and sought, called for some sort of organic relation.

At its Cleveland meeting of December, 1897, the Council, as a provisional measure, voted a subsidy to the treasury of the *Review* of a dollar a member, in return for which the numbers of the *Review* for July and October, 1898, should be sent to each member of the Association. A year later the Association, at its New Haven meeting, in December, 1898, proceeded to make a more permanent arrangement with the Board of Editors. According to its terms, the Association was thenceforward to pay to the publisher two dollars per annum for each member, in return for which the *Review* was to be sent to each; and the Council of the Association was to have the right to elect members of the Board, as their terms expired.

In 1901, on the resignation of the managing editor, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Michigan, a member of the Board, was chosen to that position. In addition to the fresh intelligence and wisdom he brought to it, he benefited the journal

greatly by drawing into its circle new groups of contributors and by pursuing lines of tendency too little regarded hitherto. During his four years of service, moreover, and partly by reason of the high confidence which his abilities inspired, an arrangement was effected which in any view must be regarded as having been of great advantage to the *Review*. In 1903 the trustees of the Carnegie Institution of Washington agreed, at the instance of the Board of Editors, that Professor McLaughlin, coming to Washington as director of the Bureau (now Department) of Historical Research which the trustees were then establishing, should also, as a recognized part of his duties, continue to edit the *Review*. This arrangement was continued in force when, in 1905, on the resignation of Mr. McLaughlin, the writer of the present narrative was appointed by the trustees of the Carnegie Institution to succeed him as director of the same department and by the Board of Editors to be his successor as managing editor. The arrangement at once relieved the treasury of the *Review* of any charge for salary of that office, made it possible to pay regularly for articles (reviews had always been paid for), and provided an unusual amount of assistance in the work of editing. The *Review* is greatly indebted to its series of sub-editors, and most of all to Miss Elizabeth Donnan, now an assistant professor in Wellesley College, who served it in that capacity for seven years.

In the external history of the *Review* in recent years, the chief event has been the action, in 1916, by which the Board of Editors transferred to the American Historical Association whatever rights of ownership it possessed.<sup>4</sup> At the time, the transfer seemed to some members of the Association a matter of considerable moment. The relations between the Board, the publishers, and the Association doubtless seemed to these members needlessly complex; they might easily seem anomalous, to those who were not aware of the strikingly wide variety of arrangements which subsist in this country between scientific societies and scientific journals. Probably many members believed that the Association supported the *Review*, or paid much the greater part of its expenses, and therefore ought to own it, or perhaps did own it. In reality the Association at that time was paying four-ninths of its cost, the Carnegie Institution three-ninths, the publishers two-ninths. But though the Board of Editors supposed itself to be the legal owner of the journal, in so far as its history permitted anyone (unless the publishers) to claim its ownership, and though, when the question was raised, competent

<sup>4</sup> For the details, see *Review*, XXI. 459, 462, 466; XXII. 531; XXIII. 524, 525.



legal authority sustained that view, the editors did not attach serious importance to the inquiry. Since it is admitted that, under whatever ownership, a scientific journal ought to be edited solely in the interest of its readers (and the readers, in this instance, are, nearly all, members of the Association), it is only in the case of substantial pecuniary profits that it can matter who is its owner; and pecuniary profits could not in this case be expected. As a matter of fact, the Association assumed ownership just in time to incur the heavy responsibilities resulting from the extraordinarily enhanced cost of paper and printing. But under the circumstances the Board of Editors, when acting in the interest of the Association, has taken no different action from what it would have taken if acting solely on its own responsibility—it has reduced the number of pages and otherwise kept down expenses, without, it is hoped, seriously impairing the usefulness of the journal.

Apparently the transfer of ownership, or questions respecting it, would have excited little interest if they had not been involved with questionings raised at the same time concerning the constitution and management of the Association itself. But the recent history of the American Historical Association is another story,<sup>5</sup> and it suffices here to say that that society, which like most other such societies had hitherto been managed by a moderate number of those most interested, was in 1915 undergoing a mild revolution or reorganization in a democratic sense. Students of the history of democratic revolutions know that, from the most violent to the most urbane, they present certain analogies. When constitutions are thrown into the melting-pot, it is natural to question anything that looks like special privilege, any arrangement that seems to be based on history rather than on logic. So *Messieurs les Rédacteurs* became *les citoyens rédacteurs*, with entire complaisance, but are still elected by the Council in the same manner, and, it is hoped, for the same reasons, as before.

When the *Review* had completed its twentieth volume, it printed<sup>6</sup> a classified statement of the fields in which its many articles had lain. A fresh calculation, made now that the number of volumes has increased from twenty to twenty-five, would require little change in some of the indications which the former list gave as to the interests and predilections of American historical writers; thus, the proportion of articles in American history still remains about forty per cent. But the last five years show one striking difference. The

<sup>5</sup> Its history from its foundation in 1884 to the year 1909 has already been recounted in this journal, XV. 1-20.

<sup>6</sup> XXI. 194.



statement made in 1915 justly recorded it as "a strange and not wholly creditable fact" that "out of nearly four hundred articles only eight have related to the history of Europe since 1815". The Great War, if it has done no other good thing, has worked powerfully toward redressing this deficiency. The total number of such articles is now already twice as great. It is true that, of those which the five years have added, nearly a dozen in number, several were the result of editorial instigation, for the war-time policy of the editors was very distinctly that of seeking to clarify public opinion on the issues of the war by adding to public knowledge of the most recent periods of history.<sup>7</sup> But it is also plainly true, and a fact of great and encouraging significance, that the war, among other sobering effects, has caused historical scholars to ask themselves, more searchingly than ever before, what things in history are most worth while, what lines of historical investigation are most likely to be profitable toward the instruction of mankind, to estimate practical values, to question conventional topics and procedures. "The historian's insight into the past", said Niebuhr, whose youth had been passed during the French Revolution, "will be the deeper, the greater and the more terrible the events he has witnessed with a bleeding or a rejoicing heart". When we see the crop of first-rate historians which the Reformation, and again the French Revolution, working upon young minds, produced in the next generation, we cannot doubt that the war just ended, the downfall of monarchies, the sudden rise of democratic and socialistic republics, above all perhaps the communistic revolution in Russia, will in turn bring into existence in each civilized country an extraordinary generation of historians, will produce a harvest the like of which the present generation has not seen.

If the work of the future is to be such as we could neither estimate nor perhaps understand, at least we shall have left to it a comprehensive record of our doings, and full evidence of what we thought in matters of history. Twenty-five volumes, twenty-two thousand pages of print, two or three cubic feet of rather solid historical matter! It is at least an impressive monument to one generation of historical workers in America. It might have been better; it must have been useful. Our thanks to all who have helped to make it so!

J. F. J.

<sup>7</sup> "Historical Scholars in War Time", XXII. 831-835.

## THE RECALL OF THE LEGIONS: A PHASE OF THE DECENTRALIZATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

### I.

BRITISH colonial policy, as it was formulated in the seventeenth century and developed during the eighteenth, was predominantly commercial, yet it had to take cognizance of other matters, and notably of colonial defense. According to the accepted mercantile theory of colonization, England derived political strength and economic benefit from the trade of her colonies regulated in her own interest, and in return for these advantages she assumed the obligation of defending the colonies, at least by naval force, against rival imperial powers. To have compelled or induced the colonists to contribute directly to the support of the navy would have been contrary to the principle of reciprocal service upon which the imperial system was supposed to rest.<sup>1</sup>

On the side of military defense, it may be said that prior to the close of the Seven Years' War the mother country recognized no obligation to protect the colonies from attacks by native tribes or to preserve law and order within them. "British colonies were expected to raise their own militia and to provide for their own defense, as though each one of them had been an England in herself."<sup>2</sup> In colonies peculiarly liable to attack at the hands of hostile European powers, such as Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New York, South Carolina, and Jamaica, English garrisons were quartered, but their cost to the mother country was small.<sup>3</sup> "It was only under exceptional circumstances and under the stress of absolute necessity, that any English forces whatsoever were permanently maintained in America. This remained the practice until 1763."<sup>4</sup>

The bitter and prolonged imperial rivalry between France and Great Britain in the eighteenth century made the military defense of the British colonies a subject of prime importance. The conflict with the French and their Indian allies partook of the character

<sup>1</sup> Beer, *Old Colonial System*, pt. I., vol. I., p. 108 *et seq.*; *id.*, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*, pp. 6-8.

<sup>2</sup> Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, II. 37; *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., "Report from the Select Committee on Colonial Military Expenditure", p. 320.

<sup>3</sup> Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*, pp. 10-14.

<sup>4</sup> Beer, *Old Colonial System*, pt. I., vol. I., p. 119.

of both imperial and local warfare, but no general principle defining the respective military responsibilities of colony and mother country was laid down. It was the opinion of the late George Louis Beer, who wrote our clearest statement respecting defense as a part of the old British colonial system, that prior to the Seven Years' War, "there was no distinct theory nor any well-defined practice regarding the military activities and duties of the colonies in time of war with a European power".<sup>5</sup> The colonies were expected to repel invasion to the limit of their ability, and upon occasion colonial troops co-operated with British forces in offensive operations against the French.<sup>6</sup>

During the French wars it was the practice of the home government to instruct the colonial authorities to furnish quotas of troops for offensive or defensive military operations, but its instructions were in fact merely requests which the colonial assemblies frequently failed to comply with. This method of "defense by supplication" reached its climax and disclosed most clearly its inherent inadequacy and inequitableness during the last intercolonial war (1754-1763).

Since it had seemed impossible to solve the problem of colonial military defense by establishing in the colonies a federal government with power to raise and maintain a common intercolonial army, such as was proposed in the Albany Plan of 1754, consideration was given to the possibility of maintaining a British army in the colonies and taxing the colonists by authority of Parliament for its support.<sup>7</sup> The Grenville administration, which came to power in 1763, determined, as is well known, to establish a standing army of 10,000 men in the colonies, and to tax the colonists by parliamentary authority for the partial defrayal of the expenditure involved.<sup>8</sup> Despite the fall of French power in North America, plausible rea-

<sup>5</sup> *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>6</sup> For example, the capture of Port Royal in 1710 was effected by a joint British and colonial fleet and a force composed of New England regiments and British marines; Louisbourg was taken in 1745 by a New England force transported in colonial vessels and convoyed by a British squadron. Fortescue, *op. cit.*, II. 255, 258; Earl Grey, *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*, I. 43, 261.

<sup>7</sup> Franklin, the principal author of the Albany Plan, later gave it as his opinion that the separation of the colonies from Great Britain might have been postponed, had the plan been adopted. A federal colonial army, such as the plan provided for, would have made unnecessary a British army in the colonies, and therefore, the taxation of the colonies by Parliament.

<sup>8</sup> The military establishment was fixed in 1763 at 17,500 for Great Britain; 10,000 for the colonies; about 4000 for Gibraltar and Minorca; and 12,000 for Ireland. Fortescue, *op. cit.*, III. 10.

sons could be alleged for maintaining numerous garrisons in the forts and posts recently won, and for taking precautions for the future; and certainly no one who had imperial interests at heart could argue very forcibly for a continuation of the old requisition system.

The two measures of the Grenville ministry for raising a revenue in the colonies to meet the expenses of defending them were the Sugar Act of 1764 and the Stamp Act of 1765, which together were expected to produce somewhat less than one-half of the revenue necessary to meet the expenses of the British troops stationed in the colonies.<sup>9</sup> In addition, Parliament in 1765 passed a Quartering Act requiring the several colonies to provide barracks for the troops, as well as to furnish them with certain supplies and transportation. From the point of view of the British Empire this legislation was a tragic failure. Its most palpable result was to provoke the colonists to united opposition and to incite them to a questioning of parliamentary authority over them. In 1766 the Rockingham ministry repealed the Stamp Act and modified the Sugar Act in a manner relatively satisfactory to the colonial merchants, who had been its most bitter opponents; and the Quartering Act led to little but unseemly controversy between the British government and the assembly of New York.

Not less disastrous was Charles Townshend's Revenue Act of 1767. Its preamble made it perfectly clear that the new duties which it laid on articles imported from Britain were intended not for commercial regulation, but for revenue, part of which was to go to "defraying the expenses of defending, protecting, and securing" the colonies. Townshend merely taught the colonists to call still further in question all parliamentary authority. And meanwhile, of course, "the expenses of defending, protecting, and securing" the colonies were borne almost entirely by the taxpayers of Great Britain—pompous preambles to the contrary notwithstanding.<sup>10</sup> As a force stationed in the colonies for the purposes officially set forth the army was farcical. Only if intended as an instrument for the promotion of colonial irritation could it have been adjudged a success. With the further progress of events that resulted in American independence we are not here concerned, but it should be remembered that the train of occurrences that led up to the disrup-

<sup>9</sup> Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*, p. 286.

<sup>10</sup> From 1769 to 1774, inclusive, the parliamentary duties collected in the continental colonies, Bermuda, and the Bahamas averaged about £31,500 per annum, with an annual cost of collection of £13,000. Channing, *History of the United States*, III. 90.

tion of 1776 had for its starting-point a question of colonial defense.<sup>11</sup>

II.

Britain emerged from the war of the American Revolution shorn of prestige and the larger part of her old empire. With the coming of peace in 1783 her military forces were reduced, but it was deemed necessary still to maintain some 9500 troops for colonial service.<sup>12</sup> Almost the whole expense of supporting them fell upon the mother country.<sup>13</sup> The disastrous attempt of Grenville and Townshend to extract revenue from colonies for the support of British troops quartered therein was not repeated. On the contrary, Parliament, recognizing, when too late to avert the disruption of the empire, that "taxation by the Parliament of Great Britain for the purpose of raising a Revenue in His Majesty's Colonies, Provinces and Plantations in North America has been found by Experience to occasion great uneasiness and disorders", enacted in the following words what was clearly intended to be a binding pledge:

That from and after the passing of this Act the King and Parliament of Great Britain will not impose any Duty, Tax or Assessment whatever, payable in any of His Majesty's Colonies, Provinces or Plantations in North America or the West Indies; except only such duties as it may be expedient to impose for the Regulation of Commerce: the net produce of such duties to be always paid and applied to and for the use of the Colony, Province or Plantation in which the same shall be respectively levied in such manner as other duties collected by the authority of the Respective General Courts or General Assemblies of such Colonies etc. are ordinarily paid and applied.<sup>14</sup>

This belated concession to the American revolutionists failed wholly as a measure of conciliation, but the pledge which it gave, though not legally binding on succeeding Parliaments, has in fact been observed, not only in respect of the colonies to which the act expressly referred, but as a general principle of British colonial policy.<sup>15</sup> The

<sup>11</sup> Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup> Fortescue, *op. cit.*, III. 499.

<sup>13</sup> This statement does not apply to India. The expense of defending India, as indeed of conquering and governing it, has been defrayed out of Indian revenue; cf. Seeley, *Expansion of England*, course II., lecture III. On the anomaly of the distinction between Indian and colonial defense, cf. *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., "Report from the Select Committee on Colonial Military Expenditure", pp. 126, 141.

<sup>14</sup> 18 Geo. III., c. 12. This statute also repealed the memorable tea duty.

<sup>15</sup> "We attempted to tax the North American colonies, *not for imperial*, but *for colonial* objects. Rebellion made us recoil from the attempt, and the 18 Geo. III., cap. 12, gave assurance to the colonies that the attempt would not be repeated. It never was repeated with these colonies, nor has it been repeated by the impe-

troops which the imperial government has seen fit to maintain in the colonies have been paid by the British treasury, assisted in some cases by contributions from the colonies.

The outcome of the American Revolution produced, no doubt, a feeling of depression in England with regard to colonies in general. This was reflected in the abolition of the Board of Trade and of the office of colonial secretary in 1782, as well as in the political and economic literature of the day.<sup>16</sup> But the war with Revolutionary France was accompanied by an imperialistic revival, and an enlargement of her empire was the most obvious result of that prolonged conflict so far as Britain was concerned. To guard her scattered dependencies in America, the West Indies, the Mediterranean, Africa, Asia, and Australia, numerous garrisons were deemed necessary. The expense of maintaining them was borne almost wholly by the mother country. Earl Grey, colonial secretary from 1846 to 1852, wrote in his *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration* (page 44): "I believe it was not until the time of the great revolutionary war with France, that nearly the whole burden of the defense of the Colonies was undertaken by this country." And in the course of testimony given before a parliamentary committee in 1861 he observed: "It is to be remarked that for a very long series of years this country has acted on the principle of taking their [the colonies'] defence entirely upon herself."<sup>17</sup> To the same effect is a statement made by Mr. Adderley, who was under-secretary for the colonies in the Derby-Disraeli ministry, that "our earliest and most vigorous colonists in North America defended themselves, as in fact they governed themselves, and separated from us in resentment of our interference. Our second Colonial policy was to govern and defend Colonies from home."<sup>18</sup>

rial parliament with any other colony, except perhaps during the short period during which the constitution of Canada was suspended. No doubt, what the imperial parliament did not venture to do, the crown has ventured, and achieved, too, in many of the colonies, but always for colonial purposes." Sydney Smith Bell, *Colonial Administration of Great Britain*, p. 404. The 18 Geo. III., c. 12, did not repeal all parliamentary duties then in force in the colonies, e.g., duties levied upon certain imports into the province of Quebec by the Quebec Revenue Act of 1774 (14 Geo. III., c. 88). These latter imposts long continued to form an important part of the public revenue of Canada (cf. Lord Durham's *Report*, ed. by Lucas, II. 141).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hertz, *The Old Colonial System*, ch. X.

<sup>17</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, p. 150.

<sup>18</sup> Review of "The Colonial Policy of Lord J. Russell's Administration" by Earl Grey, 1853, and of *Subsequent Colonial History*, p. 380. Cf. Merivale, *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies*, p. 585.

The purpose for which military forces were maintained varied according to the character and local conditions of the colony. In the case of military and naval stations, Gibraltar and Malta for example, the primary purpose was imperial defense. In Canada, it was precaution against foreign aggression; in Jamaica, the preservation of law and order among the blacks; at the Cape, protection against powerful and warlike native tribes.<sup>19</sup>

Argument was not wanting to justify the heavy expenditure to which the people of Great Britain were put in consequence of this policy. Many military men, aware of the traditional opposition to a powerful standing army in England, must have agreed with the Duke of Wellington that it was advisable to maintain strong garrisons in the colonies as reserves. The assertion was frequently made that the presence of British "red-coats" was an outward and visible sign of imperial unity which it would be dangerous to obliterate. Then, too, since the colonies might at any moment be involved in war by reason of the foreign policy of the mother country, it was only just, so the argument ran, that they should be protected at her expense from the consequences of that policy. Furthermore, it was held by many that the control of military affairs by the colonial governments might lead to cruelty and violence on their part toward natives.<sup>20</sup>

In 1834 a select parliamentary committee was appointed "to inquire into the Military Establishment and Expenditure in the Colonies and Dependencies of the Crown". Lord John Russell, Grote, and Charles Buller were among its members. It was found that the total charges incurred for the year 1832 for the military defense of the dependencies, classified as "military and maritime stations", "plantations and settlements", and "penal settlements", was £2,003,397 and the actual net cost to Great Britain £1,761,505.<sup>21</sup> The committee urged that the strictest economy should be observed in every branch of colonial military expenditure and recommended a few trifling reductions of forces and expenditure, but in the following resolution recognized it as an obligation resting on the imperial government to provide for the security of the colonies, even in time of peace:

That it is not the Intention of this Committee, by any suggestion which it may offer as to the Amount of Force deemed to be sufficient for the Garrison of any Colony in time of Peace, to relieve the Executive Gov-

<sup>19</sup> Merivale, *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies*, p. 587, note; also *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, p. 132.

<sup>20</sup> Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, third series, CLXV. 1039-1041.

<sup>21</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1834, vol. VI., "Report from Select Committee on Colonial Military Expenditure", appendix, pp. 112-113.



ernment from the Duty which constitutionally belongs to it, of providing, on the responsibility of the King's Ministers, a Force sufficient for the Security of His Majesty's Possessions abroad, which Experience has proved is liable to vary in time of Peace, according to several contingencies arising out of internal or external causes.<sup>22</sup>

The system of colonial military defense at the expense of Great Britain continued with but slight modification until the sixties. To quote from the report of an interdepartmental committee appointed in 1859 to investigate the expense of military defenses in the colonies:

the Colonies of Great Britain may be said, speaking generally, to have been free from the obligation of contributing, either by personal service or money payment, towards their own defences—a state of things which we believe to have no parallel or precedent in the case of any other organized community of which the history is known.<sup>23</sup>

This report shows that the total military expenditure in the colonies for the year ending March 31, 1858, was £3,968,599, toward the defrayal of which the colonies contributed only £378,253, or less than one-tenth, leaving £3,590,346 as the cost to the imperial government. It appeared, furthermore, that of the total colonial contributions about two-thirds were paid by the three colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, and Ceylon, that several colonies contributed nothing and that only Canada, the Cape of Good Hope, and one or two of the West Indies had organized any militia or other local force.<sup>24</sup> A parliamentary committee on colonial military expenditure, appointed in 1861, found that the imperial government had expended on the military defense of the dependencies during the year ending March 31, 1860, £3,225,081, the colonies having contributed £369,224.<sup>25</sup> It may not be superfluous to point out that this system whereby Great Britain held herself responsible for the military defense of the whole empire was similar to that which still prevails with respect to naval defense. In the former case, as in the latter,

<sup>22</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1834, vol. VI., "Report from Select Committee on Colonial Military Expenditure", p. iii.

<sup>23</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1860, vol. XLI., "Report of the Committee on Expense of Military Defences in the Colonies", p. 3. By way of contrast with British colonial policy the report referred to the Dutch and Spanish colonies, which yielded surplus revenues to their mother countries. It stated that in 1857 "the surplus revenue paid by the Dutch colonies into the metropolitan exchequer, after defraying all their military and naval expenses, was 31,858,421 florins (about £2,600,000). The estimated surplus revenue from the Spanish colonies for the past year (1859) was 115,000,000 reals (about £1,150,000)." *Ibid.*, p. 3, note.

<sup>24</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1860, vol. XLI., report cited, pp. 4-5.

<sup>25</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., "Report from the Select Committee on Colonial Military Expenditure", pp. iv-v.



initiative and responsibility rested with the imperial government, and some of the colonies made financial contributions or raised local forces.

III.

The burden to Great Britain of providing military defense for the colonies was naturally a favorite theme with anti-imperialists. Josiah Tucker and Adam Smith, precursors of the later school of "Little Englanders", though attacking the colonial system primarily on economic grounds, did not wholly neglect the subject of colonial defense. In 1776, that *annus miserabilis* of British imperial history, the former published a tract entitled *The True Interest of Great Britain set forth in regard to the Colonies*<sup>26</sup> and the latter his *Wealth of Nations*. Though he wrote before England had assumed very heavy obligations for colonial defense, Tucker enumerated as one of the "manifest advantages" which would accrue to the mother country from the independence of the colonies the fact that she would be relieved of an expenditure of between £300,000 and £400,000 for their civil and military establishments, "for which generous Benefaction", he added, "we receive at present no other Return than Invectives and Reproaches".<sup>27</sup> Adam Smith, in the course of his bold indictment of the colonial system as a scheme of monopoly injurious both to colonies and to mother country, included in the cost of the colonies to Great Britain the expenses of naval forces maintained to prevent colonial smuggling and of colonial military establishments.<sup>28</sup> Though he realized that considerations of national pride and prestige, as well as the interest of the governing classes of England, would prevent the voluntary

<sup>26</sup> Published in *Four Tracts on Political and Commercial Subjects* (Gloucester, 1776). Tucker wrote, in all, thirteen tracts on the subject of the American colonies, the central idea of which, as stated by himself, was "that the colonists in quarreling with the mother country are essentially hurting themselves and greatly tho' not intentionally benefitting us by obliging us to see and pursue our own true and lasting interest". W. E. Clark, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 57. There is no evidence to show that Adam Smith influenced, or was influenced by, Tucker; Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 225.

<sup>27</sup> *Four Tracts*, p. 216.

<sup>28</sup> Nor was this all. "If we would know the amount of the whole [cost of colonies to Great Britain], we must add to the annual expense of this peace establishment the interest of the sums which, in consequence of her considering her colonies as provinces subject to her dominion, Great Britain has upon different occasions laid out upon their defence. We must add to it, in particular, the whole expence of the late war, and a great part of that of the war which preceded it. The late war was altogether a colony quarrel, and the whole expense of it, in whatever part of the world it may have been laid out . . . ought justly to be stated to the account of the colonies. . . ." *Wealth of Nations*, ed. by Cannan, II. 116.

LIBRARY

COAST ARTILLERY

SCHOOL

abandonment of the colonies by Great Britain, he said that one of the great advantages to be derived by her from such an outcome would be freedom "from the whole annual expense of the peace establishment of the colonies".<sup>29</sup> According to the Father of Free Trade, despite all the attempts that had been made to monopolize the trade of colonies, "no country has yet been able to engross to itself anything but the expense of supporting in time of peace and of defending in time of war the oppressive authority which it assumes over them".<sup>30</sup>

The teachings of Adam Smith did not, of course, captivate at once the government and ruling classes of Britain.<sup>31</sup> Indeed after the loss of the American colonies British colonial policy became and for a time remained more rather than less restrictive.<sup>32</sup> The evil days of "Mr. Mother Country", to use Buller's famous term, fell in the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. But Adam Smith was never silenced. His free-trade and anti-imperialistic doctrines were perpetuated by the classical economists and the Benthamites.<sup>33</sup>

The Manchester School was fond of enlarging upon the burdensomeness of colonies to the harassed British taxpayer. England was pictured as a weary Titan struggling under a crushing burden. This view was forcefully expressed by Cobden in the course of a speech delivered in the House of Commons on June 22, 1843.

He was not opposed to the retention of colonies . . . and he believed that colonization, under a proper system of management, might be made as conducive to the interests of the mother country as to the emigrants themselves. But he also believed that the system upon which our colonial affairs were now conducted was one of unmixed evil, injustice and loss to the people of this country. . . . He found that the mother country furnished her colonies with an army and a navy, and maintained every description of military defence all over the world; that in some cases

<sup>29</sup> *Wealth of Nations*, II. 116.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 127.

<sup>31</sup> Lord Shelburne was the first prime minister to be influenced by Adam Smith. In his *Autobiography*, written in 1801, he speaks of Smith as one whose "principles have remained unanswered for above thirty years, and yet when it is attempted to act upon any of them, what clamor!". Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne*, I. 24.

<sup>32</sup> R. C. Mills, *Colonization of Australia*, p. 9.

<sup>33</sup> Mills, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20. In a letter addressed to the French Convention, *Emancipate Your Colonies*, Bentham in 1793 exhorted the Convention to free the French colonies. He asked ". . . how long will you take our example to govern you, and of all parts of it those which are least defensible? Is it a secret to you any more than to ourselves, that they cost us much, that they yield us nothing—that our government makes us pay them for suffering it to govern them . . .?" *Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. by Bowring, IV. 415-416.

YSAAB1  
YB1117A 13400  
100102

this country supplied the colonies with schoolmasters, with bishops, with magistrates; that she built them lighthouses, constructed their canals, and, in fact, the mother country not only did not derive any revenue from her colonies, but that, besides maintaining for them large fleets and armies, she paid almost everything that constituted the governmental expenses of the colonies. . . . The distribution of the British forces on the 1st of January this year he found to be this: out of 88,510 rank and file, there were stationed abroad (exclusively of India) 44,529 rank and file, the number left at home being 43,981. Thus, it appeared that more than half of our army was stationed in the colonies. But it had been stated by the authorities at the Horse Guards, and it was also stated by the noble Lord the Member for Tiverton, when Secretary of War, that for every 10,000 men in the colonies, 5000 were wanted in England for the purposes of making the necessary exchanges, and for recruiting the regiments abroad; therefore not merely half, but three-fourths of our army were devoted to the colonies.<sup>34</sup>

So long as Great Britain pursued the policy of commercial restriction upon which the colonial system rested, the executive governments of the colonies were held responsible to the imperial government. As a writer on colonial administration put it, "it was obviously impossible for us to liberalize our system of administration until we should first have liberalized our commercial policy".<sup>35</sup> So long, moreover, as colonial governments were responsible to an external authority it could be argued that this authority was justly chargeable with the military defense of the colonies, not only against foreign powers but against internal dangers as well. That free trade arrived at the same time with the beginning of colonial self-government was not fortuitous. They were related causally, and with them logically went a change in the system of colonial military defense. Earl Grey in his work on colonial policy already referred to makes clear the connection between these three subjects:

I think it will follow, that when this Country no longer attempts either to levy a commercial tribute from the Colonies by a system of restriction, nor to interfere needlessly in their internal affairs, it has a right to expect that they should take upon themselves a larger proportion than heretofore of the expenses incurred for their advantage. . . . Our military expenditure on account of the Colonies is certainly very heavy. . . . This expenditure ought, I think, to be very largely reduced; and the Colonies, now that they are relieved from all that is onerous to them in their connection with the Mother country, should be required to contribute much more than they have hitherto done to their own protection.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Hansard, third series, LXX. 205-207.

<sup>35</sup> Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

<sup>36</sup> *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*, I. 18, 43. See also Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions*, III. 1248.

## IV.

It was the free-trade government of Lord John Russell (1846-1852), in which Grey held the office of colonial secretary, that took the first steps in the direction of modifying the system of colonial defense which had been in operation for the preceding half-century. A beginning was made with New South Wales, a colony free from the menace of either warlike native tribes or foreign powers. Soon after the Russell ministry took office, Earl Grey directed the governor of New South Wales to send all disposable forces in the colony to New Zealand, retaining at Sydney only a small garrison which, under the circumstances, was all that the imperial government deemed necessary. In this despatch he took the position that thenceforth the people of New South Wales must provide for the maintenance of internal order by the formation of an adequate force of police or militia. Despite local opposition, the policy which he outlined was carried out in the case of the Australian colonies. That policy, briefly stated, was that a certain maximum force should be maintained at imperial expense, and that any additional British troops that might be desired must be paid for by the colony which asked for them. Barracks and other military buildings were transferred to the colonies, which were held responsible for providing quarters for the imperial troops still retained. According to testimony given in 1861 by Herman Merivale, one of the leading colonial experts of the day and previously under-secretary of state for the colonies, Lord Grey's plan for the military defense of the Australian colonies worked in a satisfactory manner. It undoubtedly stimulated the formation of volunteer forces. In 1859 there were only some 1800 British troops in Australia, while the number of local volunteers amounted to about 9000.<sup>37</sup>

In an important despatch to the governor of Canada, in March, 1851, Lord Grey outlined a military policy for Canada similar to that already applied to New South Wales. He announced that the imperial troops in the province would be confined for the future to garrisons in two or three fortified posts and that the use of the barracks would be made over to the provincial authorities if the parliament of Canada was prepared to maintain them at its own expense. If British forces were desired at any of the other posts previously occupied, they would be supplied by the imperial government, provided the cost was met by the province. The colonial secretary was careful to add that this policy, though necessary in justice to the people of Great Britain, was not to be taken to mean

<sup>37</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, pp. 11, 19, 278, 312 *et seq.*

that the connection between Canada and the mother country could be broken without great injury to both or that there was any probability that it would be broken. Reductions of the British forces in Canada were soon effected. During the Crimean War troops still stationed there were withdrawn for service against Russia, and increased responsibility for military defense was thrown upon the province. The main reliance for the military defense of Canada was for the future to be the patriotism and loyalty of the Canadian people.<sup>38</sup> By the beginning of 1861 the number of imperial troops in the province had been reduced to less than 2000, most of whom were stationed at Quebec, Kingston, and Montreal; and volunteer forces aggregating about 4500 had been organized.<sup>39</sup>

Lord Grey thus describes the policy which as colonial secretary he had formulated and begun to apply:

... we endeavoured to establish, and by degrees to act upon, the principle that the Colonies can only look to the Mother-country for military support in any dangers to which they may be exposed from a powerful foreign enemy; that Her Majesty's troops are not to be expected to undertake the duties of police, and of maintaining the internal tranquillity of the Colonies; and that the Colonies ought to undertake to provide for the expense of barracks for such of Her Majesty's troops as may be stationed in them for their protection.<sup>40</sup>

And later he expressed the opinion that the policy had been carried into effect during his tenure of office as far as it safely and properly could be.<sup>41</sup>

In 1856, Sir William Denison, governor of New South Wales, made a significant proposal, which, if adopted, would have shifted the initiative in providing for the military defense of the colonies from the imperial to the colonial government. He recommended

That, whatever may be the mode in which the military force in a Colony may be raised and organized, the mother country and the Colony shall contribute towards its expense in equal proportions, and that the Government of the Colony should have the responsibility of determining the amount of that force, whether in peace or war.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, pp. 308-311. In this connection it is significant that at the time of the Indian Mutiny Canada tendered a regiment for imperial service, which was mobilized and actually served. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 405.

<sup>39</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, pp. 3, 278.

<sup>40</sup> *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*, I. 44; this statement of policy was not intended to apply to imperial naval and military stations, such as Malta and Bermuda.

<sup>41</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, p. 150.

<sup>42</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1860, vol. XLI., "Report of the Committee on Expense of Military Defences in the Colonies", p. 9.

The imperial government declined to accede to this proposal on the ground that it could not be carried out "without compromising the independent action of the central Government of the empire".<sup>43</sup>

More important than the Denison proposal was a report of a committee appointed in 1859 to prepare a general plan of colonial military expenditure. Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century the same minister was at the head of both the Colonial and the War Office. This arrangement, whatever may have been its disadvantages, possessed a certain convenience so far as the military defense of the colonies was concerned. In consequence of the Crimean War, the Colonial and War offices were separated, and, as a result, the Secretary for War was obliged to defend in Parliament expenditure incurred for the defense of the colonies, of whose needs he had no official knowledge and with whose governments he held no direct communication. He inevitably found himself embarrassed by the lack of any general principle determining questions with which he was called upon to deal. Accordingly, on March 14, 1859, the War Office, at the direction of the secretary, General Peel, addressed a note to the Colonial Office, suggesting the propriety of adopting arrangements "which should define the respective liabilities of this Department and the various Colonial Governments, in respect to military expenditure". It was the opinion of the secretary

that England should assist in the defence of her Colonies against aggression on the part of foreign civilized nations, and (in a less proportion) of formidable native tribes; but in no case, except where such Colonies are mere garrisons kept up for Imperial purposes, should she assume the whole of such defence . . . [and] that military expenditure, for purposes of internal police, should be defrayed from local funds, there being no grounds for drawing any distinction between a Colony and an independent nation in this respect.

He proposed the appointment of an interdepartmental committee, representative of the Colonial Office, the Treasury, and the War Office, to prepare a general scheme of colonial military expenditure.<sup>44</sup> Such a committee was appointed, consisting of Sir T. F. Elliot of the Colonial Office, Mr. George A. Hamilton of the Treasury, and Mr. John Robert Godley of the War Office. The report, to which some reference has been made,<sup>45</sup> was not signed by the representative of the Colonial Office, who found himself unable to concur with his colleagues and submitted a separate memorandum in the

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>44</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1860, vol. XLI., report cited, pp. 1-2.

<sup>45</sup> *Supra*, p. 24.

nature of a minority report.<sup>46</sup> The committee found that the total imperial expenditure for colonial military defense for the year ending March 31, 1858, was approximately £3,600,000, and the total colonial expenditure approximately £375,000.<sup>47</sup>

The report attacked the existing policy of colonial defense on two principal grounds: (1) that it imposed an enormous burden on the people of Great Britain, not only in taxes but also by withdrawing a large part of their military forces from home; and (2) that it tended to prevent the development among the colonists of a spirit of self-reliance and to enfeeble their character. It pointed out that existing arrangements were attended with great inequality and chronic discussions with regard to the respective liabilities of the imperial and colonial governments. There were, it was asserted, "no recognized principles of mutual relations to which appeal can be made, or upon which a permanent settlement can be founded". The report did not recommend the adoption as a general policy of Lord Grey's plan for the defense of the Australian colonies. The presence of even small garrisons in the colonies, maintained on the initiative of the mother country, would be taken, it was said, as a symbol of her responsibility for colonial military defense and would "tend to perpetuate the main evils of the present system, namely, the dependence of the Colonies on the mother country for defense, and their neglect of local efforts".

What the report proposed was to divide the colonies into two classes: (1) military posts, garrisoned by the imperial government for imperial purposes, rather than for local defense; and (2) all other dependencies where troops were stationed primarily for the protection of the inhabitants. In the case of the latter, it recommended that the system of defense should be founded on two simple principles: "colonial management, and joint contribution at a uniform rate". It proposed that the imperial government should call upon each colony to decide on the nature of its own defenses and should offer to bear a share—one-half was the proportion suggested—of the entire cost. Among the advantages anticipated by the

<sup>46</sup> The report and memorandum are printed in *Parl. Papers*, 1860, vol. XLI., "Report of the Committee on Expense of Military Defences in the Colonies", pp. 2-18.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4. Merivale, in a later edition of his *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies*, published in 1861, p. 590, thus analyzed the purposes for which this imperial expenditure had been incurred: Defense of posts for military, convict, commercial, and other special purposes, £1,600,000; defense of colonies against foreign powers solely, £400,000; defense of colonies against foreign powers and internal disturbances, but chiefly the latter, £600,000; defense of colonies against warlike natives, £1,000,000.



committee from the adoption of its plan were: (1) that it would result in a great saving to the British exchequer without imposing an unduly heavy burden on the colonies; (2) that it would be applicable alike in time of peace and of war; (3) that it would stimulate the patriotism, self-reliance, and military spirit of the colonists by throwing on them responsibility for their own defense; and (4) that "it would convey, in the most marked and emphatic way, the determination of the mother country, that the colonies should be governed through and for their own people".

The representative of the Colonial Office dissented from some of the major proposals of the report. In particular, he did not accept the principle that all the colonies should bear a uniform proportion of the expense of their military defense, irrespective of local conditions, such as the degree of exposure to invasion, the character of the colonial population, and the wealth of the colony. Nor did he concur in the position taken by his colleagues that the only ground for military assistance to the colonies was that the imperial government controlled the issues of war and peace. On the contrary, he held that the interests of Great Britain were involved, and that they would suffer if certain colonies were lost. He preferred Lord Grey's plan to that recommended by the committee.<sup>48</sup>

This report of 1859 resulted in no radical change in the system of colonial defense. Its principal proposal, which had previously been made by Sir William Denison, that the initiative in providing for colonial defense should be thrown upon the colonies, was not at once adopted. The immediate outcome was fairly stated by Godley, in a criticism of Elliot's memorandum, when he said: "We have, with trifling exceptions, the same extravagance on our side, the same helplessness on theirs; the same confusion, inconsistency, and disputation which has prevailed more or less for the last century in our military policy towards our Colonies."<sup>49</sup>

## V.

But the demand for reform was insistent, and on March 5, 1861, on motion of Mr. Arthur Mills, a select committee was appointed by the House of Commons "to Inquire and Report whether any and what Alterations may be advantageously adopted in regard to the

<sup>48</sup> Merivale says of the interdepartmental report of 1859: "this paper contains a thorough political discussion of the general subject, by Mr. Godley of the War Department, and Mr. Elliot of the Colonial Office, whose opinions widely differ, and are powerfully defended." *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies*, p. 587, note.

<sup>49</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, p. 319.



Defence of the British Dependencies, and the Proportions of Cost of such Defence as now defrayed from the Imperial and Colonial Funds respectively". The meetings of the committee extended over a period of nearly four months. It examined a number of witnesses who were able to speak with authority on colonial, military, and fiscal questions, notably Earl Grey, Mr. Elliot, Mr. Merivale, General Sir J. F. Burgoyne, inspector-general of fortifications, Mr. Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Godley.<sup>50</sup>

For the purposes of the inquiry the report divided the British dependencies, exclusive of India, into two classes: (1) colonies proper, and (2) military garrisons, naval stations, convict depots, and dependencies maintained chiefly for objects of imperial policy. In the former class it included the North American, South African, and West Indian colonies, Ceylon, Mauritius, New Zealand, and the Australian colonies with the exception of Western Australia; in the latter, Malta, Gibraltar, the Ionian Islands, Hong Kong, Labuan, Bermuda, the Bahamas, St. Helena, the Falklands, Western Australia, Sierra Leone, Gambia, and the Gold Coast. The committee found that for the year ending March 31, 1860, the imperial military expenditure for the colonies proper was £1,715,246 and for the dependencies of the second class, £1,509,835—a total of £3,225,081. For the same year the dependencies, including some of both classes, contributed £369,224.<sup>51</sup> In the case of the dependencies of the second class, the committee agreed that "the responsibility and main cost of their defence properly devolves on the Imperial Government", but with respect to the colonies proper, it recommended that "the responsibility and cost of the military defence . . . ought mainly to devolve upon themselves", the imperial government using its discretion in applying this principle to particular colonies. Not the recommendation of the committee of 1859, but rather an extension of Lord Grey's policy for the defense of the Australian colonies, was the solution of the problem urged by the select committee.

It will be remarked that the classification of the dependencies adopted by the committee of 1861 is not identical with that which divides them into "self-governing colonies" and "crown colonies"; not all of what the committee classed as "colonies proper" were self-governing. All of the witnesses examined by the committee

<sup>50</sup> The report of the committee, together with minutes of evidence and appendixes, is printed in *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. iv-v. Gladstone informed the committee that a great part of what appeared in returns as colonial expenditure did not lighten the burden of the British exchequer but was paid "simply by way of addition to the regular pay and allowances of the forces". *Ibid.*, pp. 255-256.

agreed that colonies enjoying responsible government should bear the primary responsibility for their military defense.<sup>52</sup> This view was clearly stated by Gladstone when he said: "The privileges of freedom and the burdens of freedom are absolutely associated together; to bear the burdens is as necessary as to enjoy the privileges, in order to form that character which is the great ornament of all freedom itself."<sup>53</sup>

On March 4, 1862, the House of Commons adopted without a division the following resolution introduced by Mr. Mills:

That this House (while fully recognizing the claims of all portions of the British Empire to Imperial aid in their protection against perils arising from the consequences of Imperial policy) is of opinion that Colonies exercising the rights of self-government ought to undertake the main responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security, and ought to assist in their own external defence.<sup>54</sup>

This resolution may fairly be called conclusive, for the principle which it expressed has not since been questioned by any British ministry.<sup>55</sup> In 1863 the Duke of Newcastle, then colonial secretary, notified the governors of the Australian colonies that thenceforth those colonies must pay for all imperial troops retained within them at the rate of £40 a year for every soldier, and announced that if additional troops were furnished at the request of a colony, the rate of pay would be £70 per man, "a sum which more nearly approaches the real cost to the Imperial Government of each soldier".<sup>56</sup> By 1870 the last of the imperial troops had been withdrawn from Australia. In New Zealand, where imperial forces had been stationed for defense against the warlike Maoris, the imperial government relinquished the control of native affairs to the colonial authorities in 1863, and in 1869 the last of the British troops were recalled. The same policy was applied to Canada. Even after the creation of the Dominion in 1867, however, some British troops were retained, and it was not until the time of the Boer War that the imperial government ceased to maintain garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt.<sup>57</sup> The cost to Great Britain of the military defense of Cape Colony had long seemed disproportionately great, and

<sup>52</sup> Hansard, third series, CLXV. 1035.

<sup>53</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, vol. XIII., report cited, p. 257.

<sup>54</sup> Hansard, third series, CLXV. 1060.

<sup>55</sup> Todd, *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*, p. 393; Adderley, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

<sup>56</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1871, vol. XLVII., "Correspondence respecting the Affairs of the Cape of Good Hope", p. 2.

<sup>57</sup> On the withdrawal of the imperial troops from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, see Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions*, III. 1249-1256.

in 1867 the colony was notified that the force maintained there would be reduced at once and that after 1869 the colony must pay for all troops retained, at the Australian rate.<sup>58</sup> Troubles with the natives and continued friction between the British and the Boers made it impossible to carry out this policy so soon, but the imperial forces were gradually reduced. The despatch of British troops in great numbers to South Africa during the Boer War was, of course, no part of a permanent colonial policy. In the self-governing colonies, now styled dominions, the system of military defense has for years past rested upon local legislation, and its cost has been defrayed out of local funds.<sup>59</sup>

In practice, British policy has gone even beyond the resolution of 1862. In the case of some colonies which are not self-governing, as, for example, Ceylon and Mauritius, the burden of military defense has, for the most part, been shifted from the imperial to the colonial governments. This statement does not, of course, apply to such dependencies as Gibraltar, which are held and garrisoned for imperial purposes. So rapid was the progress of the new policy that the imperial expenditure on account of the colonies was reduced from £3,388,033 in 1869 to £1,708,290 in 1873, and a colonial under-secretary informed the House of Commons that most of this latter amount was for imperial and not colonial purposes.<sup>60</sup>

## VI.

It was freely and frequently asserted during the third quarter of the nineteenth century that the colonial policy of Great Britain aimed at the dissolution of the British Empire. Publicists and writers on colonial administration did not hesitate openly to advocate this "solution" of the imperial problem.<sup>61</sup> It is not strange that this was so, for the Manchester School, whose doctrines were then politically in the ascendant, subscribed to the colonial as well as to the commercial teachings of Adam Smith. The colonial system having fallen with the fall of protection, why retain the colonies? This was a question to which British politicians found it difficult to give a convincing answer. Anti-imperial tendencies reached their climax during Gladstone's first ministry (1868-1874),

<sup>58</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1871, vol. XLVII., "Correspondence respecting the Affairs of the Cape of Good Hope", p. 1.

<sup>59</sup> See Keith, *op. cit.*, III. 1262.

<sup>60</sup> Hansard, third series, CCXIV. 1527-1528.

<sup>61</sup> See, e.g., Bell, *op. cit.*, and Goldwin Smith, *The Empire*; also writers referred to in G. B. Adams, "Origin and Results of the Imperial Federation Movement", in *Proceedings of the Wisconsin Historical Society*, 1898.

and the recall of the imperial troops from the colonies, which was then proceeding rapidly, seemed to many people, and not unnaturally, to foretell the disintegration of the empire. Several events occurred during the early part of this ministry that lent a coloring of plausibility, to say the least, to such a prediction. The words of Disraeli, uttered during the course of a famous speech delivered in 1872, come to mind:

If you look to the history of this country since the advent of Liberalism—forty years ago—you will find that there has been no effort so continuous, so subtle, supported by so much energy, and carried on with so much ability and acumen, as the attempts of Liberalism to effect the disintegration of the Empire of England. . . .<sup>62</sup>

The testimony of the leader of the Conservative party is not to be accepted as that of a witness who desired to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth about the Liberal party, nor is the implication warranted that Liberals only were infected with the virus of anti-imperialism. Liberalism had undoubtedly been more hospitable than had Conservatism to the "Little England" propaganda, but no one who examines the evidence is likely to escape the conclusion that most British statesmen of the day, to whichever party they belonged, viewed the possibility of colonial independence without dismay.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER.

<sup>62</sup> *Selected Speeches of the Earl of Beaconsfield*, ed. by Kebbel, II. 530.

## NEW LIGHT ON THE ORIGINS OF THE WORLD WAR, II. BERLIN AND VIENNA, JULY 29 TO 31

UNTIL the recent publication of the *Kautsky Documents*<sup>1</sup> and the new *Austrian Red Book*<sup>2</sup> it has been believed by many that at a famous military council at Potsdam on the evening of Wednesday, July 29, the German militarists triumphed over the civilian diplomats and that the Kaiser at that time gave the fatal decision for war. The reason for this belief is natural. At the close of the council Bethmann returned to Berlin, sent for the British ambassador, and

proceeded to make the following strong bid for British neutrality. . . . Provided that neutrality of Great Britain were certain, every assurance would be given to the British government that the Imperial Government aimed at no territorial acquisition at the expense of France should they prove victorious in any war that might ensue. About the French colonies he was unable to give a similar undertaking. . . . It depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium. But when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany.<sup>3</sup>

It has quite naturally been believed that the German Chancellor would never have taken this step, so extraordinary, so apparently self-incriminating, and as it turned out, so infelicitous, unless he knew that Germany had already taken the decision for war. But if one looks more closely at the actions of these men during those frightful sleepless days and nights, one comes to the conviction that the prevailing belief is not wholly correct. Bethmann still had the upper hand over the militarists during the following day. He had been able to persuade the Kaiser that no decision should be taken until an answer had been received from Vienna to a proposal which had been urged by England and Germany in the interests of the

<sup>1</sup> A few of these have been translated into English in *German Secret War Documents* (Amer. Assoc. for International Conciliation, no. 150, May, 1920).

<sup>2</sup> An English translation has been announced by Allen and Unwin, but has not been accessible to me. In addition to the works noted in my previous article, vol. XXV., pp. 616-639, may be noted: E. Müller-Meiningen, *Diplomatie und Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 1917, 2 vols.), very prejudiced but full of convenient documents; Freiherr von Liebig, *Die Politik von Bethmann-Hollweg* (third ed., Berlin, 1919, 2 parts), a typical Pan-German indictment of the whole "Bethmann-Hollweg system" before, during, and after the crisis of July, 1914; P. Hildebrandt, *Das Europäische Verhängnis* (Berlin, 1919), sane, with illuminating comment on the economic and political background; see also, below, note 44, on Russia.

<sup>3</sup> *Dipl. Corresp.*, p. 64.

peace of Europe.<sup>4</sup> And it was not until two days later, about noon of July 31, after the arrival in Berlin of official news of the Russian general mobilization,<sup>5</sup> that is, mobilization against Germany as well as against Austria, that the Kaiser took the final decision to issue the fatal proclamation of "Imminence of War".<sup>6</sup> During these three days, July 29 to 31, Germany was making a real, though belated, effort to induce Austria to accept a peaceful solution.

By Monday evening, July 27, the Kaiser and the militarist leaders had returned to Berlin.<sup>7</sup> They were all vexed at the way in

<sup>4</sup> "By the military authorities the wish had been expressed to proclaim *drohende Kriegsgefahr*; he had, however, hitherto represented successfully to His Majesty his own expressed view to the contrary and military measures had been limited to military protection of the railways". Bethmann's statement to the Prussian Cabinet July 30, *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 456. This is confirmed also by the report to Munich from Lerchenfeld, the Bavarian minister in Berlin, late on July 30 (*Kautsky Docs.*, vol. IV., p. 145): "Still no answer from Vienna. The Chancellor, however, has tonight declared to the Vienna Cabinet in the most emphatic manner that Germany cannot be towed in the wake of Austria's Balkan policy. In case Austria replies affirmatively, the Chancellor does not give up hope of maintaining peace. Peace, however, is not certain, for the mobilization which has already been begun by Russia, will make a backdown very hard for Russia. Germany's procedure is rendered very difficult, because one doesn't know whether the measures taken in Russia and France are a bluff or in earnest."

<sup>5</sup> Cipher telegram of Pourtalès to Bethmann, July 31, despatched 10:20 A.M., arrived 11:40 A.M.: "General mobilization of army and navy ordered. First mobilization day, July 31." *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 473.

<sup>6</sup> Bethmann to Tschirschky, July 31, 1:45 P.M.: "After the Russian general mobilization we have ordained *drohende Kriegsgefahr*, which will presumably be followed within 48 hours by mobilization. This unavoidably means war. We expect from Austria immediate, *active* participation in the war against Russia." *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 479; cf. nos. 477, 480, 488, 490-492, 499.

<sup>7</sup> Rumbold was incorrect in his date in reporting to Grey on July 26: "Emperor returns suddenly tonight [Sunday] and Under-Secretary of State says that Foreign Office regret this step which was taken on His Majesty's own initiative. They fear that His Majesty's return may cause speculation and excitement." *Dipl. Corresp.*, p. 29. He did not return to Berlin until Monday afternoon; for he was still at sea on Sunday evening (*Kautsky Docs.*, no. 221, note 2), and at 11:20 A.M. on Monday Bethmann was telegraphing arrangements to meet him at the Wildpark railway station to give him the latest despatches (*ibid.*, no. 245, note). Moltke, before the crisis arose, had planned to return from Carlsbad to Berlin on July 25, but delayed a day (*ibid.*, nos. 74, 197), probably at Bethmann's request. Tirpitz, on July 24, had been requested by Bethmann not to return from Switzerland, in order to avoid arousing remark which might embarrass the "localization" policy; nevertheless he did return on his own responsibility three days later: "On July 27 when I arrived in Berlin . . . I, as well as the Kaiser who had returned against the Chancellor's wish on his own decision, and my ministerial colleagues who were now streaming together into Berlin, had a false view of the situation" [in thinking Germany might still, in spite of Russia's military preparations and the threatening mobilization of the English fleet, be able to steer clear of war]. Tirpitz, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 213 f., 236 f.

which Bethmann had kept them absent from Berlin and insufficiently informed. They had been told by him that to secure the successful "localization" of the Austro-Serbian dispute, calm was necessary; but they were doubtless of the same mind as the Kaiser, who, while at sea, pencilled ironically on one of Bethmann's injunctions to calmness in spite of rumors of Russian mobilization: "To remain calm is the citizen's first duty! just keep calm, always keep calm!! A calm mobilization is, to be sure, something new."<sup>8</sup> They were all alarmed at the way Bethmann had allowed Berchtold to draw so heavily on the blank cheque of July 5. A serious crisis was developing for which no special military preparations had been made. It was not so certain that Bethmann's policy of "localization" would succeed after all. His optimism might prove to be a frightful blunder.<sup>9</sup> Russia, drawing encouragement from France and England, was making much louder objections and more wide-reaching military preparations than had been anticipated. Sir Edward Grey, usually so calm and friendly, was reported to be "vexed for the first time" at Austria's over-speedy rejection of Serbia's conciliatory answer and at Germany's failure to influence her ally.<sup>10</sup> The Kaiser, too, had been irritated at sea because it was through a newspaper agency, and not officially through Bethmann, that he had first learned the terms of Austria's demands on Serbia;<sup>11</sup> and also because Bethmann, hearing that the Kaiser had acted on a Wolff telegram and made plans for the rapid return of the navy, had "suggested most humbly that Your Majesty do not order a premature return of the fleet". Upon this the Kaiser made the characteristic annotation:

Unbelievable presumption! Unheard of! the idea never occurred to me!!! This was done because of the message of my Ambassador about the mobilization at Belgrade! This *may* cause mobilization of Russia; *will* cause mobilization of Austria! In this case I must keep my forces on land and sea *together*. In the Baltic there is not a single ship!! Moreover I generally take military measures not according to *one* Wolff

<sup>8</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 197.

<sup>9</sup> Helfferich and Tirpitz, writing their recollections with the advantage of hind-sight, claim that they quickly realized this; but Bethmann, more honest and frank, but with a less clear perception of what Bismarck used to call the "imponderabilia", has always unswervingly asserted that he steered the only available course under the circumstances.

<sup>10</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 258.

<sup>11</sup> Kaiser to Foreign Office, July 26, *ibid.*, no. 231. This, together with what was said in my first article, seems to dispose effectively of Bunsen's "private information that the German ambassador [Tschirschky] knew the text of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia before it was despatched and telegraphed it to the German emperor". *Dipl. Corresp.*, p. 74.



telegram but according to the general situation and this the *Civilian* Chancellor has not yet grasped!<sup>12</sup>

In spite of irritation at the Chancellor, there was still substantial solidarity of opinion on that Monday afternoon, July 27, in agreeing that he was correct in his idea that a peaceful solution could be found for the crisis, but that, to secure this, his policy of strict "localization" of the Austro-Serbian conflict must be abandoned. Germany must recognize that the matter had become one in which the other Powers were interested. She must give some heed to Grey's reiterated proposals for mediation and to Russia's attitude of protest. Consequently she must immediately attempt to take back into her own hands that control over her ally in the Serbian question which she had so foolishly abandoned on July 5. Instead of saying at Vienna, as she had done three weeks earlier, that the Kaiser "naturally cannot take any stand in the questions open between Austria and Serbia for they are beyond his competence",<sup>13</sup> the Kaiser must at once begin to give advice to Austria and bring her back within the bounds of moderation. Hitherto Germany as well as Austria had been rendering nugatory the several peace proposals sincerely suggested by the Entente Powers.<sup>14</sup> To continue to do this would

<sup>12</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 182. Cf. also nos. 125, 221, 231, and Tirpitz, *Erinnerungen*, p. 219. Tirpitz, if we are to believe his later recollections, made efforts to oust Bethmann from office and to replace his incompetent subordinate, Jagow, by some strong and able man like Hintze, who unfortunately, however, at the moment was sitting in Mexico. But though the Kaiser had been momentarily irritated with Bethmann, he declared "that he could not part with this man because he enjoys the confidence of Europe". *Ibid.*, p. 237; cf. also pp. 204-249, where the difference of moral and political outlook between Tirpitz and Bethmann is revealed on almost every page.

<sup>13</sup> See above, vol. XXV., p. 627.

<sup>14</sup> (a) Proposals by Russia and by England for extending the time-limit, purposely rendered by Austria impracticable both by the shortness of the time-limit and the lateness at which the Powers were notified; (b) a proposal for mediation between Austria and Serbia by the four less directly interested Powers, rejected outright by both Germany and Austria; and (c) a proposal for mediation between Austria and Russia, at first on July 25 "accepted in principle" by the German authorities; Lichnowsky urged it in three telegrams (*Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 157, 179, 180), and Jagow replied to Rumbold in Berlin that he was "quite ready to fall in with the suggestion" (*Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 17-18, 23); through Lichnowsky, however, Jagow stated a little more reservedly that "the German Government accept in principle mediation between Austria and Russia by the Four Powers, reserving of course their right as an ally to help Austria if attacked" (*ibid.*, p. 40; cf. also pp. 55, 429, and *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 192). But when the Kaiser, while he was at sea, saw the proposal for mediation by the Powers, he jotted in the margin: "It's superfluous! For Austria has already explained her intentions to Russia and Grey cannot propose anything else. I'll not join in; only if Austria expressly requests me, which is not likely. In questions of honor and *vital interests* one does not consult others." The substance of this, wire-

be a mistake because it would simply increase the suspicion circulated by the French ambassadors<sup>15</sup> that Germany was egging Austria on, knew the text of the ultimatum from the beginning, wanted war, and was acting *mala fide* in pretending to desire peace.

Accordingly on Monday night Bethmann telegraphed to Tschirschky at Vienna the full text of Lichnowsky's report of his latest conversation with Grey. Grey had pointed out the conciliatory character of Serbia's answer, hoped Austria would not begin hostilities, and said that he was urging moderation at Petrograd, and that Germany ought to do likewise at Vienna. After emphasizing the bad impression which a further refusal of all mediation would make, Bethmann added:

We cannot reject the rôle of mediator and must place the English proposal before the Vienna Cabinet for its consideration. Request Count Berchtold's opinion on the British proposal, as well as on Sazonov's wish to negotiate directly with Vienna.<sup>16</sup>

The basis on which the Kaiser was willing to act the mediatory rôle between Russia and Austria is what may be called the "pledge plan". Though he had been greatly impressed with the extremely conciliatory character of Serbia's reply, when it finally came to him on Tuesday morning,<sup>17</sup> he nevertheless thought Austria ought to have some pledge as a guarantee that the Serbs would live up to their conciliatory promises. Tuesday night the mediatory proposal which he sketched was embodied by Bethmann in the following telegram to Vienna:

[Aside from a declaration to Russia that it intends no territorial acquisition in Serbia] the Austro-Hungarian Government, in spite of repeated questions as to its purposes, has left us in the dark. The answer now at hand of the Serbian Government to the Austrian ultimatum makes it evident that Serbia has in fact met the Austrian demands in so wide-reaching a manner that if the Austro-Hungarian Government adopted a wholly intransigent attitude, a gradual revulsion of public opinion against it in all Europe would have to be reckoned with. . . . [Russia will be satisfied] if the Vienna Cabinet repeats in Petrograd the definite

lessed to Berlin from the Kaiser's yacht by Count Wedel, caused the Foreign Office to back water at once. Jagow hastened to say that he "could not fall in with your suggestion" after all, because, as he added rather lamely and awkwardly, the proposed conference was "not practicable", and "would practically amount to a court of arbitration and could not in his opinion be called together except at the request of Austria and Russia". He advocated as a substitute the "direct conversations" between Vienna and Petrograd which Sazonov had just proposed.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 149, 164, 169, 272. *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 215, 415, 485.

<sup>16</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 277.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. above, vol. XXV., p. 637, note 78. *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 271, 293.

declaration that territorial acquisitions in Serbia lie far from its purpose, and that its military measures aim solely at a temporary occupation of Belgrade and other definite points of Serbian territory in order to compel the Serbian Government to a complete fulfillment of the demands and to serve as guarantees for future good behavior to which Austria-Hungary unquestionably has a claim after her experiences with Serbia. The occupation could be regarded like the German occupation in France after the Peace of Frankfurt as security for the demand of the war indemnity. As soon as the Austrian demands were fulfilled, a withdrawal would follow. . . . You are immediately to express yourself in this sense to Count Berchtold emphatically and have him take the proper step in Petrograd. You are carefully to avoid giving the impression that we wish to hold Austria back. It is solely a question of finding a method which will make possible the accomplishment of Austria's purpose of cutting the vital nerve of Great Serbian propaganda without at the same time unchaining a world war, and in the end, if this is unavoidable, of improving as far as practicable the conditions under which it is to be waged. Wire reply.<sup>18</sup>

To this telegram Bethmann had received no reply by Wednesday evening at the time of the military council at Potsdam, even though twenty-four hours had elapsed, and telegrams even at this time of crowded wires ordinarily were transmitted between Vienna and Berlin within three or four hours. Therefore he sent on Wednesday evening three more telegrams to secure an immediate answer.<sup>19</sup> In the meantime, however, while he could get no answer from Vienna on the "pledge plan", he began to receive reports from the other capitals which seemed to indicate bad faith or stupidity on the part of his ally. He telegraphed to Tschirschky:

These expressions of the Austrian diplomats must be regarded as indications of more recent wishes and aspirations. I regard the attitude of the Austrian Government and its unparalleled procedure toward the various governments with increasing astonishment. In Petrograd it declares its territorial disinterestedness; us it leaves wholly in the dark as to its programme; Rome it puts off with empty phrases about the question of compensation; in London Count Mensdorff hands out part of Serbia to Bulgaria and Albania and places himself in contradiction with Vienna's solemn declaration at Petrograd. From these contradictions I must conclude that the telegram disavowing Hoyos [who, on July 5 or 6 at Berlin, had spoken unofficially of Austria's partitioning Serbia] was intended for the gallery, and that the Austrian Government is harboring plans which it sees fit to conceal from us, in order to assure herself in all events of German support and to avoid the refusal which might result from a frank statement.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Bethmann to Tschirschky, July 28, 10:15 P.M., *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 323. Cf. *Red Book*, III., no. 24, and Gooss, pp. 243-244.

<sup>19</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 377, note, and 385; for Berchtold's eventual dilatory and evasive reply, see no. 388; also nos. 432 and 433.

<sup>20</sup> Bethmann to Tschirschky, July 29, 8 P.M., *ibid.*, no. 361.

On Wednesday afternoon, July 29, while still waiting in vain for a reply from Berchtold as to the "pledge plan", Bethmann took up two more peace proposals which had been suggested, and supported both energetically at Vienna. One was the suggestion from Sazonov for a negotiation by "direct conversations" between Vienna and Petrograd.<sup>21</sup> Bethmann had already handed this suggestion on to Vienna without comment as soon as it had been received by him on July 27.<sup>22</sup> But it had been at once flatly rejected by Berchtold, because Sazonov had intended that the direct conversations should take up modifications of the terms of Austria's ultimatum. Berchtold was determined not to enter into any negotiations which might touch the "local" issues existing purely between Austria and Serbia. As an additional reason for his refusal to "converse directly" on Austro-Serbian relations, he pointed out that the time for a peaceful settlement of those relations was passed, since the declaration of war and the opening of hostilities had already taken place. As a result "direct conversations" between Vienna and Petrograd had come to a halt on July 28, with the result that Sazonov was much incensed.<sup>23</sup> Sazonov had concluded, though mistakenly, that because Berchtold flatly refused to discuss Austro-Serbian relations, he was also unwilling to converse at all with Russia. To re-open "direct conversations", and to clear up what seemed to be an unfortunate misunderstanding between Vienna and Petrograd, Bethmann sent now three more telegrams to Vienna very late on Tuesday night.<sup>24</sup> After mentioning hopefully the interchange of telegrams which had begun between the Kaiser and the Tsar,<sup>25</sup> and minimizing the danger of the rumored Russian military preparations, Bethmann added severely:

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, nos. 238, 282.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, notes to nos. 238, 292.

<sup>23</sup> For this abortive result of the proposals for "direct conversations", see *Red Book*, II., nos. 73, 95; III., nos. 16, 17, 19, 20; *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 40, 58, 85, 177, 197-199, 203, 205, 213, 505, 522-524. A comparison of the first edition of the *Red Book*, published in the *Dipl. Corresp.*, with the new edition shows that the former characteristically omits some of the most important sentences and paragraphs.

<sup>24</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 383, 385, 396.

<sup>25</sup> I pass over these because they have long been familiar; it may be noted, however, that their wording in the *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 411-413, 431-432, 542, being a translation from English into German and from German back again into English, differs somewhat from the original English always used in the Willy-Nicky correspondence. Also the date of the Tsar's first telegram (p. 431, exhibit 21) should be July 29, 1 A.M., and not 1 P.M., and that of his third telegram (exhibit 23a) should be July 30, 1:20 A.M., and not 1:20 P.M.; that is, these two efforts of the Tsar took place twelve hours earlier than was represented, whether by intention or by a mere error, in the original German *White Book*.

The refusal of every exchange of views with Petrograd would be a serious mistake, for it provokes Russia precisely to armed interference, which Austria is primarily interested in avoiding. We are ready, to be sure, to fulfill our obligations as an ally, but must refuse to allow ourselves to be drawn by Vienna into a world conflagration frivolously and in disregard of our advice. Please say this to Count Berchtold at once with all emphasis and with great seriousness.<sup>26</sup>

The other plan which Bethmann also cordially took up late Tuesday night was Grey's proposal for mediation between Austria and Russia, either by the four Powers, or by Germany alone, on the basis of Serbia's very conciliatory original answer and the news from Rome that she was now ready for the sake of peace "on condition of certain interpretations to swallow even articles 5 and 6, that is, the whole of the Austrian ultimatum".<sup>27</sup> This proposal of Grey's was eagerly welcomed by Bethmann as a possible happy solution. In sending it on to Vienna, he genuinely again "pressed the button", by adding: "Please show this to Berchtold immediately and add that we regard such a yielding on Serbia's part as a suitable basis for negotiation along with an occupation of a part of Serbian territory as a pledge."<sup>28</sup> But Berchtold was still deaf to the button; he eventually made the characteristic reply that, though the integral acceptance of Austria's note would have been satisfactory before hostilities had begun, "now after the state of war has begun, Austria's conditions must naturally take another tone".<sup>29</sup>

Grey's proposal was all the more eagerly welcomed by Bethmann, partly because Grey quickly supplemented it by embodying the two very points which Germany herself had already been urging at Vienna and Petrograd in her "pledge plan", *viz.*, a new statement by Austria of her intentions in Serbia which would satisfy Russia, and a pledge in the shape of the temporary military occupation of Belgrade which would satisfy Austria; and partly because Grey gave his first "warning". As Lichnowsky reported his conversation with Grey:

to him [Grey] personally a suitable basis for such mediation seemed to be that Austria, after the occupation perhaps of Belgrade or other places, should announce her conditions. Should Your Excellency [Bethmann], however, undertake the mediation as I was able to propose to him early this morning as a possibility, this would, of course, suit him just as well. . . . [At the close of the conversation Grey] said he wanted to make

<sup>26</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 396.

<sup>27</sup> Lichnowsky to Bethmann, July 29, 2:08 P.M. *Ibid.*, no. 357; *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 53-54.

<sup>28</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 384.

<sup>29</sup> Tschirschky to Bethmann, July 30, 3:20 A.M. *Ibid.*, no. 432.

me a friendly and private statement. . . . It would be possible for her [England] to stand aside so long as the conflict is limited to Austria and Russia. But if we and France should be drawn in, then the situation would immediately be a different one, and the British government under the circumstances would be forced to rapid decisions. In this case it would be impossible to stand aside for long and to wait; "if war breaks out, it will be the greatest catastrophe that the world has ever seen". He was far from wishing to utter any kind of threat; he merely wanted to save me from being misled and himself from the reproach of insincerity and, therefore, chose the form of a private explanation.<sup>30</sup>

Upon hearing of this alarming possibility that England might not remain neutral, so contrary to all that Lichnowsky, King George, and the general British situation had led him to expect, Bethmann immediately transmitted the whole conversation to Vienna and proceeded to "press the button" very vigorously:

If Austria refuses all negotiations, we are face to face with a conflagration in which England will be against us, Rumania and Italy according to all indications will not be for us, and we shall stand two against four Powers. Through England's opposition the main blow will fall on Germany. Austria's political prestige, the military honor of her army, as well as her just claims against Serbia, can be adequately satisfied by her occupation of Belgrade or other places. Through her humiliation of Serbia, she will make her position in the Balkans as well as in her relation to Russia strong again. Under these circumstances we must urgently and emphatically urge upon the consideration of the Vienna Cabinet the adoption of mediation in accordance with the above honorable conditions. The responsibility for the consequences which would otherwise follow would be for Austria and for us an uncommonly heavy one.<sup>31</sup>

To this urgent request by Germany for Austria's acceptance of a solution which perhaps even yet might have avoided the conflagration of Europe, Berchtold gave no definite or frank answer. Bethmann's telegram, inclosing Lichnowsky's conversation with Grey, after being deciphered was handed to Tschirschky Thursday, July 30, while he was at lunch with Berchtold. "Berchtold listened, pale and silent, while they were read through twice; Count Forgách took notes; finally Berchtold said he would at once lay the matter before the Emperor."<sup>32</sup> After Berchtold had departed to put on another suit of clothes in which to present himself before His Majesty, Tschirschky spent a good part of the afternoon setting

<sup>30</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 368; cf. also Grey's report to Goschen of the same conversation, in *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 66-67.

<sup>31</sup> Bethmann to Tschirschky, July 30, 2:55 A.M. *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 395. Cf. also Goschen to Grey, *Dipl. Corresp.*, p. 84; Gooss, pp. 233-246.

<sup>32</sup> Tschirschky to Bethmann, dated July 30, but despatched July 31, 1:35 A.M. *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 465.



forth long and earnestly to Forgách and Hoyos all of Bethmann's arguments. It was useless. Instead he was cynically informed by these two intimate advisers of Berchtold that "in view of the feeling in the army and in the people any checking of the military operations in progress was out of the question . . . Conrad von Hoetzendorff [Austrian chief-of-staff] would lay before the Emperor this evening the order for general mobilization, as a reply to the measures which have already been taken". He was also finally told that Berchtold could not give any answer until the following morning, for the reason that Tisza, who would not be in Vienna until then, must be consulted.<sup>33</sup> Later in the evening Tschirschky learned that Austria had decided to order general mobilization, *i.e.*, against Russia as well as against Serbia,<sup>34</sup> and that Berchtold's answer to the "pledge plan" would "presumably not be absolutely negative".<sup>35</sup> What this dubious phrase meant is now clear from Berchtold's double-faced procedure as revealed, on the one hand, in his pretended attitude to the Russian ambassador, and, on the other, in his real attitude as reported in the minutes of the ministerial council of Friday morning. With the Russian ambassador he took up conversations again in a most friendly manner and to all the Powers pretended that Austria was ready to "consider favorably" Grey's proposal. To the British ambassador in Vienna, he gave the impression, as Bunsen later wrote to Grey, that

Austria, in fact, had finally yielded, and that she herself had at this point good hopes of a peaceful issue, is shown by the communication made to you on the 1st of August by Count Mensdorff [the Austrian ambassador in London] to the effect that Austria had neither "banged the door" on compromise, nor cut off the communications. . . . Unfortun-

<sup>33</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 465.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, nos. 468, 498. *Red Book*, III., no. 50. Austrian general mobilization was not caused by the announcement of Russian general mobilization as the Germans have often asserted, nor *vice versa*, because the announcements of mobilization took place virtually simultaneously before the news could go from the one country to the other. General mobilization was the last step in Austria's game of bluff to prevent Russia from interfering in the Serbian question. She took this step primarily because of Russia's unexpected stiff attitude and because of the rumors of the wide-reaching military preparations which Russia was making. But it is highly probable that she may have been hastened in taking the step, partly by the reports of Szögyény, her ambassador in Berlin, who was too much inclined to reflect the views of the German militarists rather than of the German Foreign Office; and partly by the arrival in Vienna at 10:20 P.M. of a telegram from the Austrian military attaché in Berlin, who reported that Moltke strongly urged Austrian general mobilization. *Red Book*, III., no. 34; *cf.* Gooss, p. 307.

<sup>35</sup> Telephone message from Tschirschky to Berlin. *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 468; *cf.* also nos. 432, 433.



nately these conversations were cut short by the transfer of the dispute to the more dangerous ground of a direct conflict between Germany and Russia. Germany intervened on the 31st July by means of her double ultimatum to St. Petersburg and Paris. The ultimatums were of a kind to which only one answer was possible, and Germany declared war on Russia on the 1st August and on France on the 3rd August. A few days' delay might in all probability have saved Europe from one of the greatest calamities in all history.<sup>36</sup>

How far Berchtold, however, was from the slightest intention of really and honestly yielding to mediation and stopping the Austrian advance in Serbia is now unmistakably revealed in the protocol of the minutes of the ministerial council held on Friday morning, July 31.<sup>37</sup> After stating Grey's last proposal and Bethmann's strong urging that it be accepted, Berchtold pointed out that experience showed that mediatory powers always tried to reach a compromise by forcing one power to pare down the conditions it had made;

It was probable that they would attempt this now also, when in the present conjuncture France, England, and Italy also would represent the Russian standpoint, and we [Austria] should have a very doubtful support in the present German ambassador in London. From Prince Lichnowsky everything else was to be expected except that he would represent our interests warmly. If the action should end now merely with a gain of prestige, it would in his opinion have been undertaken wholly in vain. From a mere occupation of Belgrade we should gain absolutely nothing, even if Russia should give her consent to it. All this would be mere tinsel [*Flitterwerk*]. Russia would come forward as the savior of Serbia, and especially of the Serbian army. The latter would remain intact, and in two or three years we should again have to look forward to the attack on Serbia under much more unfavorable conditions.

He had therefore had an audience with Francis Joseph. His Majesty had at once declared that there could be no check placed upon military operations, but accepted the proposal "that we should carefully avoid accepting the English proposal in actual substance, but that in the form of our answer, we should pretend to be ready to meet it. . . ."<sup>38</sup>

Berchtold's colleagues agreed with him or went even further. Tisza, who had now completely changed his attitude, made no opposition. To Stürgkh "the very thought of a mediatory conference was so odious that he preferred to avoid even the pretense of accepting one". Bilinski was equally hostile to a conference, because "the course of the London Conference was so horrible to

<sup>36</sup> Bunsen to Grey, Sept. 1, 1914. *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 117-118; cf. also pp. 99-100, 212-213, 222, 528.

<sup>37</sup> *Red Book*, III., no. 79; Gooss, pp. 234-243, 301-306.

<sup>38</sup> *Red Book*, III., no. 79; repeated in less bald language in no. 80. Cf. Gooss, p. 302.

recall to memory, that all public opinion would reject the repetition of such a spectacle".<sup>39</sup>

Meanwhile at Berlin Berchtold's failure to heed any of Bethmann's efforts for peace and his delay in replying to Bethmann's telegrams greatly embarrassed the Chancellor's struggle to keep the upper hand over the militarists. In his arguments with them and with the Kaiser, his position was undermined by continually having to say "No word from Vienna". By July 29 he was already being pressed strongly by Moltke and by Berlin public sentiment to take a decision. Every additional hour of indecision lessened the advantage of Germany's speedy mobilization through which they hoped, if war should come, to win an overwhelming victory over France before they had to meet a large force on the eastern frontier.<sup>40</sup> Their mobilization plan contemplated going through Belgium, to which Bethmann personally was strongly opposed on moral grounds. But in the preceding months, though he must have known of the existence of this plan, he had not chosen to resign his office as a protest. Perhaps he had been so absorbed in his policy for a better understanding with England, that he had never looked squarely in the face the violation of international law which Moltke contemplated, if his own Bagdad Railway and African colonial agreements with England should fail. Now, when suddenly faced with the imminence of war with Russia, brought on by Austria's action and his own negligence, he was unable to meet Moltke's arguments of strategic military necessity. Aside from the moral objection, he might urge the practical one that it might bring in England against Germany. Moltke admitted that the addition of England to Germany's enemies would be a serious difficulty in the matter of provisioning Germany, particularly if the war should last long. But still he advised against buying England's neutrality at the price of sparing Belgium, even if this would have been possible, which he did not think was the case. An advance into France from Alsace-Lorraine would have cost the German army fully three months, and given Russia such a start that a victory on both fronts would not be possible. Therefore the only way to victory was to Paris *via* Belgium.<sup>41</sup>

Accordingly, on July 29, Bethmann was forced into the foolish

<sup>39</sup> *Red Book*, III., no. 79.

<sup>40</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 349, 372; Bethmann, *Betrachtungen*. pp. 166-169.

<sup>41</sup> Statement of Moltke's views as reported by the Bavarian minister in Berlin on Aug. 5, 1914. *Kautsky Docs.*, vol. IV., p. 157. Cf. also Moltke's confidential statements to Lieut.-Col. von Haeften about 1 A.M. on July 31, as reported by the latter in the *Nordd. Allg. Zeitung*, no. 261, Sept. 21, 1917.

act of making the bid for British neutrality which instantly roused suspicions abroad as to the German militarist intention. A courier was also despatched by Jagow to the German ambassador at Brussels, bearing a sealed document. It was not safe to trust this even to a ciphered telegram, nor was it desirable to reveal even to the ambassador himself the crime which after all it might not be necessary to put into practice. On opening it, the ambassador merely found instructions to keep safely another sealed envelope which he would find enclosed, but which he was to open only if subsequently instructed by telegram from Berlin. This inner envelope contained the detailed demands which Moltke had written with his own hand on July 26, for eventual presentation to Belgium, if war should come.<sup>42</sup> It included the absolutely fictitious statement, for which there was never the slightest evidence either on July 29 or later, that "there lies before the Imperial Government reliable information in regard to the intended advance of French troops in the Meuse district Givet-Namur. They leave no doubt of France's purpose to attack Germany through Belgian territory." Givet-Namur was the line on which Moltke, months before,<sup>43</sup> had determined to advance if war should come. Moltke also made arrangements for post-dating the document and making it appear that this "reliable information" had only arrived as hostilities were beginning. Neither in his "scrap of paper" conversation nor in his book, did Bethmann stultify himself by adopting as his own this fictitious allegation of Moltke's. Nor in his book does he seek, as many Germans have so laboriously attempted to do, to establish any justification for the violation of Belgium from the "disclosures" revealed subsequently by the German investigation of the Belgian archives. These disclosures, of course, whether there is any incriminating evidence in them or not, being subsequent to the invasion of Belgium, are no more a justification for that act than Frederick the Great's later revelations from the Dresden archives justified his attack on Saxony at the opening of the Seven Years' War.

Still more embarrassing to Bethmann in his effort to restrain the militarists was the news from Russia. For some days the reports

<sup>42</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 375, 376, 648, 735.

<sup>43</sup> At any rate as early as March 31, 1914, *cf. Kautsky Docs.*, vol. I., p. xv. The plan to go through Belgium to annihilate the French army by an attack on its flank and rear, which it had been calculated could be accomplished on the twenty-seventh day after the opening of hostilities, originated about the time of the Russo-Japanese War with Moltke's predecessor as chief of the General Staff, Count von Schlieffen; *cf. H. von Kuhl, Der Deutsche Generalstab in Vorbereitung und Durchführung des Weltkrieges* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 109, 142-179.

of the Russian "measures preparatory to war" had become very alarming. The statements of the Russian minister of foreign affairs did not harmonize with those of the Russian minister of war, and both were contradicted by the apparently unmistakable evidence of very wide-reaching military activities.<sup>44</sup>

On the morning of Thursday, July 30, it was known in Berlin that Russia had officially admitted "partial mobilization", and it was suspected, probably with good reason, that she had done much more. Nevertheless, Bethmann appears still to have kept the upper hand during the day. At its close he gave the Prussian cabinet a long and still hopeful summary of the situation; he declared that he was still supported by the Kaiser in the determination that no decision for war should be taken, until an answer had been received from Austria as to her acceptance of the "pledge plan".<sup>45</sup>

Though the Kaiser by this time was in a very excited state of mind, as indicated by a raving philippic against his Austrian ally as well as against the Entente enemies who had "encircled" Germany,<sup>46</sup> he was persuaded by Bethmann to make a personal appeal to Francis Joseph. This was followed by another telegram of Bethmann's own, warning Berchtold of the terrible consequences of a refusal to accept the "pledge plan" which was now being urged by

<sup>44</sup> The very difficult question of Russian mobilization has been most thoroughly discussed by R. Hoeniger, *Russlands Vorbereitung zum Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 1919); "Untersuchungen zum Suchomlinowprozess", in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, CLXXV. 15-80 (Apr., 1918); and "Fürst Tundutow über die russische Mobilmachung", *ibid.*, CLXXVI. 150-165 (Aug., 1918). Hoeniger has used and printed a large number of Russian mobilization orders, which the Germans afterwards captured in the Warsaw district. On the basis of these, he believes that Sukhomlinov and Januschkevitch, the Russian minister of war and chief of general staff, began on July 25 to take very wide-reaching "preparatory measures for war" which were almost equivalent to mobilization, that the idea of "partial mobilization" against Austria was really a fiction intended to deceive Germany and perhaps even the Tsar. Under cover of "partial mobilization", steps were really being taken against Germany as well as against Austria. It is also clear from the extraordinary revelations of the Sukhomlinov trial that these Russian militarists flatly disobeyed and deceived the Tsar who unquestionably worked and hoped for peace up till the very last moment. Whether Hoeniger is correct in his analysis of the nature of Russian preparatory measures for war, I cannot at present give an opinion. I think it doubtful, however, whether he is correct in thinking that Sazonov was working hand in hand with the militarists in a deliberate effort to deceive and surprise Germany. I think it more probable that they worked behind his back and that he honestly worked and hoped for peace, at least until July 29. Cf. Oman, *op. cit.*, ch. vii.

<sup>45</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 456; see above, note 4.

<sup>46</sup> Pencilled on a telegram from Pourtalès which reported that Sazonov regretted that the Russian mobilization measures could not be stopped. *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 401; translated in *German Secret War Documents*.

both England and Germany.<sup>47</sup> But the militarists were already getting the upper hand. Early in the evening Moltke had advised the Austrian chief-of-staff to order the general mobilization of the whole Austrian army.<sup>48</sup> Before 11:20 P.M. Bethmann had been told by the General Staff that Russia's military measures were so alarming that a speedy decision by Germany was necessary, unless Germany was to be taken by surprise. Bethmann for a moment abandoned hope.<sup>49</sup> A few minutes later, however, he learned that a telegram from King George V. to Prince Henry had arrived.<sup>50</sup> It was in answer to the appeal which Prince Henry had made at the Kaiser's prompting about noon.<sup>51</sup> In it King George said:

My Government is doing its utmost, suggesting to Russia and to France to suspend further military operations, if Austria will consent to be satisfied with occupation of Belgrade and neighboring Serbian territory as a hostage for satisfactory settlement of her demands, other countries meanwhile suspending their war preparations. Trust William will use his great influence to induce Austria to accept this proposal, thus proving that Germany and England are working together to prevent what would be an international catastrophe.<sup>52</sup>

Bethmann grasped at this telegram from George V. as another chance for peace. He sent it on with a last urgent appeal "for a definite decision in Vienna within the course of the day". But it had no more influence than its predecessors.<sup>53</sup> It remained, however, as a slender hope for a few hours until the arrival in Berlin of Pourtales's despatch from Petrograd confirming beyond doubt the fact that Russia had ordered general mobilization. Thereupon, as the militarists had urged, Germany declared about noon the "Imminence of War", and a little later despatched her ultimatums to Russia and France.

On the whole these new documents from Berlin and Vienna place Austria in a much more unfavorable light than hitherto. They

<sup>47</sup> Kaiser to Francis Joseph, July 30, 7 P.M., *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 437: "The personal appeal of the Tsar to undertake mediation for the prevention of a world conflagration and for the preservation of world peace, I believed it impossible to reject, and have had proposals submitted to your Government through my ambassador yesterday and today. Among other things they point out that Austria should state her demands after the occupation of Belgrade and other places. I should be deeply indebted to you if you would notify me of your decision as soon as possible." Bethmann's telegram was sent at 9 P.M., *ibid.*, no. 441.

<sup>48</sup> See above, note 34.

<sup>49</sup> *Kautsky Docs.*, nos. 450 and 451, note.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 452.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, nos. 417, 474.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 452; *Dipl. Corresp.*, pp. 538-539.

<sup>53</sup> Bethmann to Tschirschky, July 31, 2:45 A.M. *Kautsky Docs.*, no. 464.

likewise clear the German government of the charge that it deliberately plotted or wanted the war. Whatever individual militarists or Pan-German writers may have wished or said, there is no doubt that the Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg, as the official representative of German foreign policy, aimed at peace and better relations with Germany's neighbors in the period just before the war. In fact the very charge that has been most bitterly brought against him by many of his own countrymen is that he was too much a man of conciliation and peace. Germany did not will the war. In a narrow sense, even, looking merely at the events of these three days one can easily see how the Germans have become convinced that the war was forced upon them. As the crisis grew more serious, particularly after the Austrian declaration of war on Serbia and the warning from England, Bethmann did make real and sincere efforts, though belated, to hold Austria back and find a feasible solution. But he did not find adequate support from his own War-Lord and in Vienna. Berchtold had chosen his course. Austria, as was believed with reason, was growing weaker and weaker through the disintegrating force of nationalism and the ambitious imperialism of Russia, which supported the aspirations of Austria's smaller neighbors. The Serajevo crime afforded a good excuse to attempt to rehabilitate her position by action against Serbia. He counted on his powerful ally for protection in case of Russian interference. He had believed it would again be possible to bluff Russia by "rattling the sabre" of Emperor William. But imperialism and militarism, encouraged by a jingo press, had put Russia in a very different temper from that which prevailed after the Russo-Japanese War. When, therefore, Bethmann strove for peace at the eleventh hour, he failed partly because Austria and Russia were so unyielding and partly because events marched so rapidly that he could not keep control over them. In this sense Germany had war forced upon her, not, of course, by England, as has been so commonly believed in Germany, but by her own ally and by Russia.

In a wider sense, however, these new documents do not in any way relieve Germany of the main responsibility. She is responsible for her negligence in giving Austria a free hand on July 5, and in not attempting earlier and more vigorously to reassert her control at Vienna. She is responsible—and here the responsibility rests especially on the Kaiser—in deliberately blocking several peace proposals which, though they might have turned to the disadvantage of Austria, and to the diminution of her own prestige, would have been as nothing in comparison with what was to take place. One

would be more inclined to listen to her assertion that she was fighting a war of self-defense if she had not sent so precipitately her ultimatums to Russia and France and insisted in adhering to her principle that mobilization inevitably must be followed by war. In a still wider sense, also, Germany is responsible, because one may say that militarism was one of the great causes of the war. It was militarism which was largely responsible for the campaign of lies and national hatred in the jingo press of all Continental Europe which had been poisoning public opinion for years. When the crisis arose, not a little of the direction which diplomacy took in Berlin, Vienna, and Petrograd was due to the pressure of so-called public opinion. It was militarism, too, which placed in power such men without scruple as Moltke and Tirpitz, or Sukhomlinov and Janushkevitch. It is always at a time of diplomatic crisis, precisely when it is most difficult for diplomats to keep their heads clear and their hands free, that the influence of militarism makes itself felt by hastening decisions for war, or even by getting the upper hand altogether. And for the growth of militarism in Europe, no country was so much responsible as Germany.

SIDNEY B. FAY.



## THE AMERICAN WAR GOVERNMENT, 1917-1918

On April 6, 1917, nineteen officers, as prescribed by law, were stationed in Washington on duty on the General Staff of the army.<sup>1</sup> This small group of men, all of whom had been trained by years of service in the regular army, but no one of whom had ever commanded in action or seen a modern division of American troops, was required by law under direction of the chief-of-staff to formulate the plans upon which four million troops should be raised for the World War.<sup>2</sup> In his message to Congress, April 2, President Wilson had informed his fellow-countrymen that the approaching war would "involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country",<sup>3</sup> but neither could he anticipate nor had they foreseen the completeness of national reorganization that must be attained.

The United States has never, by prearrangement, made itself ready for immediate defense or for precipitate attack. In every military crisis war has been begun first and armies have been created afterwards. The object-lesson of the World War in Europe suggested to many American minds the necessity for a thorough reconsideration of national defense, and citizens working toward this, under the general name of preparedness, organized societies, held meetings, and tried to educate public opinion and members of Congress. It was a slow process to overturn the mental habit of a century and a half. In both parties were responsible politicians who denied the necessity of preparedness or who charged that it was only a selfish propaganda of corrupt munition-makers. The suggestion that a thoroughgoing investigation of national defense be made at once was repelled by the President who feared it might unsettle his policy of neutrality; and the appropriation bills of 1915 contain few indications that the United States feared danger to itself.

The diplomatic controversy arising from the *Lusitania* finally convinced the administration of impending danger. On July 21,

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the Chief-of-Staff*, 1919, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Report of the Secretary of War*, 1916, p. 49, discusses the effect of the National Defense Act upon the General Staff.

<sup>3</sup> *The War Message and Facts behind it: Annotated Text of President Wilson's Message*, Apr. 2, 1917 (Committee on Public Information, *War Information Series*, no. 1, June, 1917).

1915, when the President despatched his third and last *Lusitania* note,<sup>4</sup> he sent to his Secretaries of War and Navy brief memoranda directing them to consider and report far-reaching programmes of national defense.<sup>5</sup> From this moment until the end of the war, President Wilson never relaxed his pressure upon Congress for more and more sweeping defense legislation. In November, 1915, he came out publicly for such preparedness, and in January, 1916, he took to the stump and travelled through the Middle West, directing and focusing the rising interest in national defense. The resulting appropriation bills<sup>6</sup> undertook new programmes for both services, while on June 3 the National Defense Act reorganized and enlarged both the regular army and the militia.<sup>7</sup>

Before the summer of 1916, it had become clear to all who were observing the course of the war in Europe that military and naval reorganization alone could not constitute an adequate preparation. The war in every country brought the whole nation into arms and the utilization of the non-combatant population and its resources had become as important as the training of troops, the production of matériel, and the direction of armies in the field. In all the belligerent countries these were new tasks, slightly recognized in time of peace, if not entirely ignored. In the United States, even more than overseas, these new agencies of government were a significant need because of the peculiar restrictions inherent in the American state.

"The departments at Washington were never conceived or organized to meet the modern needs incident to mobilizing a nation."<sup>8</sup> The administrative branch of the government is organized for the purpose of spending upon specified projects funds whose availability Congress has surrounded with minute special provisions. The itemized appropriation bills are intentionally so constructed as to reduce to narrow limits the discretion of executive officers. As a natural result, the standing agencies of government, including even the army and the navy, are never prepared for any emergency which has not been foreseen. From one to three

<sup>4</sup> J. S. Bassett, *Our War with Germany* (1919), p. 79.

<sup>5</sup> The texts may be found in *New York Times*, Sept. 3, 1915, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Including provision for a government-owned armor-plate factory which had long been urged and which was now provided against the open opposition of private manufacturers. *Fleet Review*, May, 1917, p. 10; *Army and Navy Journal*, Sept. 27, 1913, p. 105; *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Aug. 30, 1917, p. 2; *New York Times*, June 17, 1916, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Report of the Secretary of War*, 1916, p. 26.

<sup>8</sup> *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Feb. 26, 1917, p. 10.

years may and often do elapse between the inauguration of a project and the arrival of available funds for its development. In the interval of waiting, the whole aspect of the world may have changed.

At the beginning of the war in 1917, the American administration included ten cabinet departments and sundry detached commissions and boards. Over some of the latter the President exercised no control after having appointed the commissioners. Each of these agencies represented its own evolution and struggle, and each, including the army and navy, was constructed to meet some other end than that of immediate war. The American administrative machinery for war, like the armed forces, had been left to be improvised after the nation had come under fire, and to the administration, already harassed by war itself, fell the burden of devising basic legislation for the emergency.

A Council of National Defense, created in the Army Appropriation Bill of 1916, was one of the few civic additions made during the period of preparedness. Even earlier than 1914 there had been individuals ready to suggest the creation of some sort of war board to do for the civil population the sort of thing that the General Staff was supposed to do for the army. The idea gained adherence among the preparedness advocates, with the result that six members of the Cabinet (the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor) were on August 29, 1916, designated as a Council of National Defense and given an appropriation of \$200,000.<sup>9</sup> Their duties were to prepare plans for the mobilization of human and economic resources in the support of the military programme. They were authorized to organize an Advisory Commission of not more than seven experts in as many fields involved in national mobilization.

No one could foresee the course which such a novel institution would follow in its development. The six *ex officio* members were necessarily involved in the administration of their departments. The duties of the council were not different from those which might be supposed to be incumbent upon the Cabinet and President. The significant fact lay in the available appropriation and the authorization of an advisory commission of experts, all of whom were detached from the cares of Cabinet members.

In addition to the Council of National Defense, the Congress of 1916 created as an emergency body the United States Shipping Board. Such a body as this had been urged upon Congress repeatedly and in vain through 1914 and 1915. Its desirability had

<sup>9</sup> *First Annual Report of the Council of National Defense*, 1917, p. 6.

been suggested when the navies of the Allied powers drove German shipping from the ocean, while the Allied governments themselves utilized more and more completely for their own war needs the rest of the world's shipping tonnage. The United States possessed no important merchant marine, and lost control of its exports. To insure provision of available American tonnage whether by construction or purchase, the administration consistently urged the passage of a shipping bill. The opponents of this measure, however, kept it from becoming law in any form until September 7, 1916,<sup>10</sup> more than two years after the need for it had arisen.

Another of the emergency organizations was the Naval Consulting Board, brought into existence informally by Secretary Josephus Daniels, in October, 1915, with duties to act as a consulting body upon naval inventions in connection with the new programme upon which the Navy Department had been at work since July 21. The great name of Thomas Alva Edison gave it special lustre, and around him were grouped engineers and scientists in the fields of naval development. A year later Congress legitimated the body by appropriating funds for its expenses.<sup>11</sup>

In another of the related fields of military invention, a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics had been created by act of March 3, 1915.<sup>12</sup>

The breach with Germany, early in February, 1917, brought to full and abrupt realization the positive lack of agencies for national mobilization. The little group of officers in the General Staff were put to work upon plans for the creation of an army, and the Council of National Defense hurried the organization of its Advisory Commission and proceeded to use this body as an informal general staff for civil purposes. The President had named the Advisory Commission during October, 1916. Daniel Willard, its chairman, was a widely known railroad president; the names of Samuel Gompers and Julius Rosenwald were household words in many parts of the country. Howard E. Coffin stood among the leaders of motor manufacturers. Hollis Godfrey was an educator of prominence, while Dr. Franklin H. Martin was identified with one of the great medical societies. Bernard M. Baruch was less known than the rest and was associated in the public mind with speculative business. On February 12, 1917, the council and the Advisory Commission settled down to the task of creating the outlines of a war govern-

<sup>10</sup> *First Annual Report of the United States Shipping Board*, 1917, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Report of the Secretary of the Navy*, 1915, p. 45; 1916, p. 67.

<sup>12</sup> *Third Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics*, 1917, p. 11.

ment in advance of the declaration of war. It had no legal authority for action, but it exercised wide power in advice, and by April 6 had sketched the larger outlines of a national programme.<sup>13</sup> The technical work in connection with the army and navy was conducted in the military departments, the Council of National Defense taking its function to be that of making the civilian resources of the country available for the military agents.

Seven great committees were organized, each with one of the members of the Advisory Commission as its chairman, and each including civilian experts and administrators, whose services were believed likely to be needed. Willard became chairman of a Committee on Transportation that speedily possessed itself of the resources of the American Railway Association and created, ready for business on April 11, 1917, the Railroads' War Board. Until the United States Railroad Administration was created, December 26, 1917, the Railroads' War Board co-ordinated the efforts that hauled materials to the cantonment sites and to the munitions factories, and that hauled the troops to camp.

The Committee on Raw Materials was formed by Baruch with sub-committees in charge of the more important single commodities. Julius Rosenwald naturally became chairman of the Committee on Supplies with a long list of co-operative committees in the several lines of manufacture. Munitions, as the most important of the supplies, received a special committee with Coffin as chairman, and shortly gave birth to a Munitions Standards Board, whose proposed duty was to standardize the specifications of army and navy matériel. Frank A. Scott of Cleveland became chairman of the Munitions Standards Board, and remained chairman when its scope was broadened and its title changed on April 9, 1917, to that of the General Munitions Board. "It was necessary", said the director of the council, "if we were going to give intelligent advice, that somehow we should have a system for clearing the needs of the Army and Navy, and for having the needs brought before the people."<sup>14</sup>

Dr. Martin organized the Committee on Medicine, while Dr. Godfrey brought together the Committee on Science and Research. Gompers created his Labor Committee before the end of February, and on March 12 procured, from a conference headed by the

<sup>13</sup> *Council of National Defense, Hearing before Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations . . . on Amendments of the Senate to H. R. 3971* (Washington, 1917), pp. 1-159, is devoted to the period prior to May 23, 1917.

<sup>14</sup> *Investigation of the War Department, Hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate* (Washington, 1918), pt. 3. p. 1859.

American Federation of Labor, a statement of the attitude of labor towards the war, that was designed to counteract the anti-war activities of certain of the Socialist labor leaders.

The meeting of the Council of National Defense and of the Advisory Commission that put in motion this series of organizations remained in almost continuous session until after the outbreak of actual war. On February 13 it listened to the report of General J. E. Kuhn upon the elements of German mobilization, as he had seen it while military attaché at Berlin. At other sessions it received counsel from Edward R. Stettinius, who had been American buyer for Allied account throughout the war, and from Herbert Hoover, whose report upon the victualling of Europe was followed by the early creation of a Food Committee with him as chairman. It shortly adopted the Naval Consulting Board as an Inventions Section, and the National Research Council as an agency for co-ordinating the efforts of scientific investigators throughout the country. Other committees were taken on as need for them appeared. The Advisory Commission concluded its formal organization by electing Commissioner Willard as chairman, W. S. Gifford as director, and Grosvenor B. Clarkson as secretary.

War<sup>15</sup> was declared with many plans in the making for the co-ordination of effort, but with the whole body of legislation still to be passed. For the next six months the history of the war government was largely a matter of emergency measures to tide over the period until Congress should take action, and of advocacy of laws granting the necessary powers.

It would have been a simpler task to prepare for American participation in the war had there been any agreement as to the form which that participation was to take. General Sharpe later testified that, "In April when the original plan for raising the army was under discussion there was no intention whatever of sending any troops abroad until March, 1918".<sup>16</sup> It was the expressed opinion of the British Premier Lloyd George that ships would win the war, and that the true duty of the United States was to build new tonnage. From another angle, food was expected to win the war. To stimulate the unlimited resources of the American farm

<sup>15</sup> The name of the war has varied in official usage. The Pension Bureau appears to have designated it, at an early period, as the War of 1917, *Washington Post*, May 20, 1917, p. 1. Subsequently the Historical Branch of the General Staff used the same designation with the approval of the Chief of Staff; but by General Orders, no. 115, War Department, Oct. 7, 1919, the name has now been changed to the World War.

<sup>16</sup> *Investigation of the War Department* (Washington, 1918), pt. 2, p. 506.

was the clear duty of Hoover's Food Committee, but before either of the programmes for ships and food was far advanced, Marshal Joffre arrived at Hampton Roads with the French Commission, bringing the imperative demand for troops at once—"Let the American soldier come now".<sup>17</sup> And behind each of these three lines of possible participation lay the need for funds.

The United States Shipping Board had the advantage of preliminary authorization during the first three months of the war. Its members had been appointed during the early winter. It proceeded, in March, to outline its plans; and the public press soon took the cue from its chairman, William Denman, and talked hopefully about "a bridge of wooden ships". Congress was at once approached for additional power and appropriations. The greatest constructor before the American public, Major-General George W. Goethals, was summoned to administer ship-building, while on April 16 the Shipping Board incorporated as its building agency the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

To revive the ancient ship-building prowess of the United States was no mean task, for, as General Goethals said, the "birds were still nesting in the trees from which the great wooden fleet was to be made".<sup>18</sup> It was a human problem as well as a productive one, since it was by law to be directed by a Shipping Board whose chief servant, General Goethals, regarded "all boards as long, narrow, and wooden"; but for some weeks before General Goethals and Chairman Denman were allowed to retire from their task, contracts flew in shoals to builders for the erection of shipping yards, and to yards for the construction of wooden ships, and fabricated steel ships.<sup>19</sup>

The food which was to be carried in ships depended largely upon the crop that could be sowed in the spring of 1917, and the amount of the reserve that could be saved. It was equally necessary to begin a propaganda for economy and for an increase in the acreage of crops. It was impossible to wait for Congress to authorize either of these, since the planting season could not outlast even a few weeks of patriotic deliberation. Hoover's Food Committee was organized during April. "The foremost duty of America towards the Allies", he announced, as he started from London to assume its chairmanship, "... is to see that they are supplied with

<sup>17</sup> *Literary Digest*, May 12, 1917, p. 1393.

<sup>18</sup> *New York Times*, May 26, 1917, p. 1.

<sup>19</sup> *United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Hearings before the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate . . . on Senate Resolution 170* (Washington, 1918, 2 vols.).



food". From day to day action from Congress was awaited while the Department of Agriculture brought into operation all of its powers to stimulate the planting. On May 19 the President appointed Hoover as Food Administrator without legal authorization, and allowed him to organize a voluntary Food Administration largely at his own expense. Not until August 10, 1917, did Congress overcome the opposition to the granting of real powers of control; and even then its creation of a Food Administration was in spite of a persistent minority that continued, through the war and afterwards, to attack the patriotism, importance, and honesty of food control. Voluntary conservation was advertised and promoted through the creation of state food administrations with an elaborate system of local sub-committees.

The military programme changed from week to week as the problem changed. The first expectation was to keep all forces in America until 1918, in order to use the existing army as a nucleus for a national army. The General Staff proposal for erecting a national army, based upon universal liability to service, was accepted by the Secretary of War and the President, and became a law on May 18. "As a result of the exchanges of views which took place between the military missions to the United States and our own Government", says Secretary Baker, "it was determined to begin at once the dispatch of an expeditionary force of the American Army to France".<sup>20</sup> On the day that he signed the Selective Service Act, the President announced this decision and that Major-General John J. Pershing had been selected to command the troops.<sup>21</sup> The administration of the draft, through its various stages of enrollment, classification, exemption, and quota, covered the country with another network of co-operative and patriotic effort, while yet a third was added as the Treasury Department built up an organization for its Liberty Loan campaign.

The provision of funds was the subject of the earliest important war legislation by Congress. With the outbreak of the war, there arose a debate upon the burden of the war. The American Committee on War Finance was organized as a propaganda association by opponents of the war and advocates of a policy that would place its burden chiefly on accumulated wealth.<sup>22</sup> The questions whether its costs should be deferred through the issuance of bonds, or raised immediately through taxation, brought to light all the argu-

<sup>20</sup> *Rept. of Sec. of War*, 1917, p. 51.

<sup>21</sup> Graphs showing the monthly strength of the A.E.F. are in L. P. Ayres, *The War with Germany: a Statistical Summary* (Washington, 1919), pp. 14, 15.

<sup>22</sup> *New York Call*, Apr. 1, 1917, p. 5.

ments in the field of war finance and drew upon the whole experience of the other belligerents.

The great fiscal debate on the "pay as you go" method of war finance was not ended until the passage of the War Revenue Act of October 3, 1917. Meanwhile, regardless of the final decision as to loans or taxes, immediate funds were indispensable. On April 24 Congress authorized a bond issue of five billion dollars, three billions of which were to provide means for advancing funds to those associates "engaged in war with the enemies of the United States". In addition to this, authority was given for the use of two billions in short-term certificates of indebtedness to be redeemed by subsequent bond issues, and to constitute a sort of revolving fund. In the provision for extending loans to the Allies, Congress started wittingly or not the train of events that led inevitably through the Allies Purchasing Commission to the Interallied Conference, the Inter-Ally Council of War Purchases and Finance,<sup>23</sup> the Allied Maritime Transport Council, the Food and Munitions Councils,<sup>24</sup> the Supreme War Council, the supreme command, and victory itself.

The weeks in which emergency machinery was created overlapped weeks in which Congress debated the fundamental policies upon which the war should be conducted. It is impracticable to separate the debates upon the several measures, since there was a running discussion over the whole field of war organization. Through the entire period of the Congress of 1917, any aspect of the debate was likely to be discussed in connection with any of the measures. The prolonged arguments began while the loan act was under consideration. Thereafter the Selective Service Act, the appropriations for the Fleet Corporation and the Aircraft Production Board, the legislation on espionage and foreign trade, the control of food and fuel, served as texts for daily argument. From week to week single statutes emerged from the deliberation and terminated for the time being single aspects of the discussion. In the long run, occasionally the very long run, public opinion supported the demands of the administration for war powers, and the powers were granted; but not until the spring of 1918, when the Overman Act became a law on May 20, could it be said that the government of the United States possessed the powers to wage a modern war.

Within the limited field of the army and the navy, these months

<sup>23</sup> London *Times*, Dec. 17, 1917, p. 9.

<sup>24</sup> J. P. Cotton and D. W. Morrow, "International Cooperation during the War," in *Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1919, pp. 807-809; ch. VI. in D. W. Morrow, *The Society of Free States* (New York, 1919).

brought increase in numbers and subdivision and reorganization of functions. The powers of the commander-in-chief were here more nearly adequate to the situation, and less special legislation was required than in the fields of civilian co-operation. The navy underwent no fundamental reorganization, for a navy, of all government agencies, is least susceptible to change after war has been declared. In the army there was the constant need of General Pershing for the best-trained service in the A.E.F., and the need of the War Department for the same trained service in raising and equipping the American divisions. Since the number of professional officers of mature years was rigidly limited, the army was compelled to make numerous compromises in order to acquire the technical and numerical strength that its task demanded. The General Staff was repeatedly reorganized, the most important dates being February 9, 1918,<sup>25</sup> and August 26.<sup>26</sup> By this latter date there existed throughout the whole army an extreme "dilution" of commissioned officers, whose purpose was to enable a few trained professional soldiers to indoctrinate the whole body.

The result of the special legislation was to bring into existence a group of war boards of which only the Council of National Defense and the United States Shipping Board were founded on authority which antedated the war. The Emergency Fleet Corporation was a manufacturing agent of gigantic scope and intricate organization, but was fundamentally subordinate in all matters of policy to the Shipping Board.

Next after the Shipping Board arose the Food Administration, with its legal authority derived from the Lever Act of August 10, 1917.<sup>27</sup> Hoover's volunteer organization was ready to be sworn into the service when the Lever Act became a law. Under Hoover the functional divisions of the Food Administration did the "staff" work for the whole campaign, while the local food administrations constituted the "line". For the control of two particular commodities it operated, as did the Shipping Board, through corporations whose stock was entirely owned by the United States. The

<sup>25</sup> *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Feb. 11, 1918, p. 1; *Rept. of the Chief-of-Staff*, 1919, p. 19; General Orders, no. 14, War Department, Feb. 9, 1918; *Army and Navy Journal*, Feb. 16, 1918, p. 914. See also F. P. Keppel, "The General Staff", in *Atlantic Monthly*, Apr., 1920, pp. 539-549.

<sup>26</sup> General Orders, no. 80, War Department, Aug. 26, 1918; *Army and Navy Journal*, Sept. 7, 1918, p. 34.

<sup>27</sup> B. H. Hibbard, *Effects of the Great War upon Agriculture in the United States and Great Britain*, no. 11 of *Preliminary Economic Studies of the War* of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (New York, 1919), p. 71.

earlier of these, the United States Grain Corporation, was announced on August 14, 1917, with a working capital which was to be used to stabilize the price of cereals.<sup>28</sup> The Sugar Equalization Board was not formed until July 11, 1918, for the performance of somewhat similar duties in the control of sugar and coffee. The system of licenses<sup>29</sup> whereby the Food Administration kept its hand upon the reserve stocks of food and their consumption and export were novelties in American life but were largely borrowed from the experiences of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium and of the foreign food controllers.

The Lever Act carried authority over fuel as well as food, and pursuant to it on August 23, 1917, President Harry A. Garfield of Williams College was designated as Fuel Administrator. The Fuel Administration machinery comprehended a network of centralized bureaus and local agents similar to that of the Food Administration, but was somewhat less pervasive in its extent.

The powers to stimulate the production and control the consumption of raw materials were largely granted in the acts of a single day, August 10, 1917. The powers over trade were derived piecemeal. It had been the experience of the Allied powers that the blockade of Germany was among the most telling weapons of the war. This could be effective only through a control of trade in order to prevent exports from the Allies from leaking into Germany, or from releasing in neutral countries neutral exports to the enemy.<sup>30</sup> The scarcity of ships, from another angle, made it important that the government have the power to compel the useful use of merchant shipping. In the Espionage Act, passed June 15, 1917, for the chief purpose of breaking up any attempt at opposition to the selective draft, the President was given authority to control exports from the United States.

The machinery for controlling trade was as fragmentary as the laws conveying power to control it. Under the Espionage Act the President brought into existence an Exports Council of *ex officio* members.<sup>31</sup> The council's duties were to formulate the policies for whose administration a Division of Export Licenses was immediately organized in the Department of Commerce. Some two

<sup>28</sup> L. H. Haney, "Price Fixing in the United States during the War", in *Political Science Quarterly*, Mar., 1919, p. 111; *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Nov., 1918, p. 17.

<sup>29</sup> *Monthly Review of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, Dec., 1917, p. 1167.

<sup>30</sup> C. H. Huberich, *The Law relating to Trading with the Enemy* (New York, 1918).

<sup>31</sup> *Rules and Regulations of the War Trade Board*, no. 1, Nov., 1917, p. 5.

months later, on August 21, 1917, an Exports Administrative Board composed of technical members named by the *ex officio* members of the Exports Council was created to direct the work of the Division of Export Licenses.<sup>32</sup> Vance McCormick, as the deputy of the State Department, became chairman of this Exports Administrative Board, and when on October 6, 1917, Congress at last enlarged the powers over foreign trade in the Trading with the Enemy Act, the President revised their administration by executive order of October 12.<sup>33</sup> The Exports Council with a slightly changed personnel became the War Trade Council, while the technical members delegated by the council became the War Trade Board with McCormick as chairman.<sup>34</sup> The War Trade Board thus joined the Food and Fuel Administrations and the Shipping Board, as a full-fledged war board. Through its Bureaus of Exports and Imports,<sup>35</sup> it exerted increasingly pervasive pressure upon all foreign trade;<sup>36</sup> through its Bureau of Enemy Trade it watched those conduits of commerce which were believed to be directly or indirectly to enemy advantage; through its Bureau of War Trade Intelligence it assembled the secret information essential to its accurate administration; and through numerous other bureaus it studied, collected, and tabulated the facts on trade. Its government-owned corporation, the Russian Bureau (Inc.), was brought into existence in the final moments of the war to bring aid to Russia by traffic through Siberia.<sup>37</sup> An Alien Property Custodian was created in the same act of October 6.<sup>38</sup>

An immediate consequence of preparation for the war was an increase in the burden upon the railroad systems of the United States. These were already operating almost to capacity in their

<sup>32</sup> *Washington Post*, Aug. 23, 1917, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup> *Enemy Trading List*, no. 1, Oct. 6, 1917 (War Trade Board), gives the text of the Trading with the Enemy Act, and the first edition of the list of proscribed firms.

<sup>34</sup> A. E. Swanson, "The Statistical Work of the War Trade Board", in *Quarterly Publications of the American Statistical Association*, Mar., 1919, p. 262.

<sup>35</sup> *Directory of the War Trade Board*, Feb. 1, 1918, pp. 5-14, gives brief definitions of function for the several bureaus.

<sup>36</sup> The Restricted Imports List was made public in its initial form on Mar. 23, 1918. *War Trade Board Journal*, no. 8, April 1, 1918, p. 13. The Exports Conservation List had first appeared Sept. 17, 1917. *Rules and Regulations of the W. T. B.*, no. 1, p. 24.

<sup>37</sup> *W. T. B. J.*, no. 16, Dec., 1918, p. 4.

<sup>38</sup> *Alien Property Custodian Rept.* (Washington, 1919) is "a detailed report by the Alien Property Custodian of all proceedings had by him under the Trading with the Enemy Act during the calendar year 1918 and to the close of business on February 15, 1919".

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.--5.

efforts to meet the peace-time needs of the country, and had, as a whole, within the past few years, failed to keep pace with the normal extension of industry. The Railroads' War Board, with Fairfax Harrison<sup>39</sup> as its chairman, undertook a voluntary administration of this crippled plant on April 11, 1917.<sup>40</sup> Every month thereafter the problems grew worse. Freight traffic for war construction, export traffic to the ports, passenger traffic to and from the camps, increased the burden; while a leakage of skilled employees into the armed forces and demands for higher wages from those who remained increased the cost.

In the late autumn of 1917 the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose powers had already been extended by an act giving it control of car service,<sup>41</sup> recommended that the railroads be taken over by the government under authority of the act of August 29, 1916, which contemplated such action in time of war. By executive action of December 26, the United States Railroad Administration was created with the Secretary of the Treasury, William G. McAdoo, as its director general. Within the next few weeks unified administration was taken off the voluntary basis and given legal sanction. Congress on March 21, 1918, enacted the terms upon which compensation should be awarded to the roads. The director general relieved their operating officials of responsibility, and through a system of regional directorships rearranged the mechanism and added another to the series of war administrations.

By the side of the Fuel and Food Administrations, the War Trade Board, and the government-conducted ship-building and transportation enterprises, a transformation of industry was working itself out in 1917. The procurement of supplies for military use had in no earlier war occupied all of the surplus of human endeavor. The Council of National Defense concerned itself with procurement from the beginning. It was the business of the technical branches of the military department—Naval Ordnance, Army Ordnance, Signal Corps, Medical Corps, Quartermaster Corps, Engineer Corps, etc., to determine upon the specifications for their matériel. In a few weeks the field of munitions expanded from

<sup>39</sup> *Washington Post*, Apr. 12, 1917, p. 5.

<sup>40</sup> This board was discontinued upon creation of the Railroad Administration. The letters involved may be found in *New York Times*, Jan. 1, 1918.

<sup>41</sup> H. E. Byram, "Principles and Practices of Car Service Regulation", in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Mar., 1918, p. 32; *31st Ann. Rept. of the Interstate Commerce Commission* (Washington, 1917), p. 65; *32d Ann. Rept. of the Interstate Commerce Commission* (Washington, 1918), p. 4.

the limited vision of the Munitions Standards Board to the broader range of the General Munitions Board. A single class of munitions was separated out on May 16, 1917, through the creation of the Aircraft Production Board, which proceeded in co-operation with the Signal Corps to devise and provide a new arm of the service.<sup>42</sup> On October 1 by special act, a legally designated Aircraft Board was given the responsibility in this connection, and in the following summer, after the Air Service had evolved, Congress authorized and the Air Service organized another of the government-owned corporations, the United States Spruce Production Corporation.

By the early summer of 1917 the award of contracts for procurement purposes had progressed so far as to reveal the limitations of the military departments that Congress had permitted to exist, the inexpertness of contractors and manufacturers, and inherent difficulties in the machinery for oversight that the Council of National Defense had improvised. The voluntary committees of business men working with the council were made up necessarily of men who were drawn from the several fields of industry. It was a poor committee that did not contain within its membership men who had learned to know textiles or clothing, boots or food, or the metal trades, in the service of the greatest corporations dealing with these products. As the time came for making war contracts, committeemen were forced to pass upon awards to their own companies. It was inevitable that discontented and unsuccessful bidders should declare that favoritism governed awards, and that some public suspicion should arise, due to the possibility that bidders might as committeemen improperly award contracts to themselves.<sup>43</sup> Debate along this line added to the confusion that delayed the passage of the Lever Bill, and in this act on August 10 was contained a prohibition against the award of contracts by government officials to themselves. The committee system of the Council of National Defense became impracticable as this restrictive legislation impended. It was moreover apparent that the war would soon make it necessary to do more than merely sort out the bidders and the plants in connection with the procurement of supplies. There came a "change in the civilian conduct of the war with the control of priorities as its dominant feature". The General Munitions Board functioned as the basic unit in the change and was on July 28 merged into a new War Industries Board, of which Frank A.

<sup>42</sup> *Rept. of the Chief Signal Officer to the Sec. of War*, 1919, p. 13.

<sup>43</sup> *Investigation of the War Department*, pt. 3, pp. 1130-1191.



Scott remained the head. In addition to military and naval members and the chairman, the new board included Baruch in charge of raw materials, Hugh Frayne, a representative of labor, Judge Robert S. Brookings, who soon specialized in the field of price-fixing, and Robert S. Lovett, a railroad expert, who shortly became a commissioner of priorities.<sup>44</sup>

As the War Industries Board gained in strength and confidence it took on new functions. On August 25 three of its members, Baruch, Brookings, and Lovett, together with the Food Administrator, became a Purchasing Commission for the Allies.<sup>45</sup> By this means the bidding of the Allies for American commodities, and the expenditure of the American loans incidental thereto, were brought within the purview of the War Industries Board, side by side with those of the army that came in through General Palmer E. Pierce, and those of the navy which came up through Admiral Frank F. Fletcher.

The system of co-operative committees in the several fields of industry was revised during the autumn in order to comply with the provisions of the Lever Act as interpreted by the Attorney General on August 29,<sup>46</sup> and finally on November 28 all of Rosenwald's committees on supplies were formally dissolved.<sup>47</sup> In place of these committees, there arose an imposing series of War Service Committees of industry put together through the agency of the United States Chamber of Commerce. In these, of which nearly five hundred were created, the representatives of the industries involved were nominated by the trade associations, confirmed by referendum votes, and formally certified by the United States Chamber of Commerce to the War Industries Board as ready and able to speak for their respective industries.<sup>48</sup> From the steel and oil industries at the top, down to the shoe-lace, and chewing-gum, and corset makers, American industry was aligned, whether for the purpose of procuring goods for the government or offering their trades to be sacrificed in the interests of conservation.

To deal with these war service committees the War Industries Board created as needed new divisions and new commodity sections, under expert manufacturers or statisticians who were required to free themselves from actual business. As the pressure of

<sup>44</sup> Max Thelen, "Federal Control of Railroads in War Time", in *Annals of the Amer. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Sci.*, Mar., 1918, p. 17.

<sup>45</sup> *Official U. S. Bulletin*, Aug. 25, 1917, p. 2; Aug. 28, 1917, p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> *Congressional Record*, Dec. 16, 1919, p. 694.

<sup>47</sup> *Investigation of the War Dept.*, pt. 3, p. 1794.

<sup>48</sup> *Monthly Review of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, Jan., 1919, p. 47.

the procurement programme bore more and more heavily upon the total of production, this interrelation of government and industry became increasingly active. Frank A. Scott was forced by ill health to retire as chairman in October, and was succeeded by Daniel Willard, chairman of the Advisory Commission.<sup>49</sup> On January 16 Willard resigned for the announced purpose of returning to his railroad, and the President after a few weeks replaced him by Bernard Baruch. The letter of the President, March 4, 1918, entrusting the War Industries Board to Baruch, showed a disposition to make the board "the great co-ordinating factor of the government". Each of the other war boards or administrations, shipping, food, fuel, trade, and railroad, was concerned with a specific task. The War Industries Board was to be the "general eye of all supply departments in the field of industry". It was to determine all priorities of production and delivery for American or Allied use. It was to have a voice in the determination of prices, although the Price-fixing Board was an independent organization, and it was to assist in conserving resources, converting them to new uses as well as creating them outright.

The period of delay between the retirement of Willard and the appointment of Baruch as his successor was the darkest period in American participation in the war. The railroad system was clogged; the shortage of fuel was limiting every variety of war production. The submarine was at the crest of its performance, while the promised new ship-yards were at best a promise.<sup>50</sup> An experienced journalist despondently declared that "We are likely to have fewer new merchant ships on January 1st [1918] than if we had never created the Emergency Fleet Corporation".<sup>51</sup> The aircraft programme was said to have failed. The growing lack of confidence in the effectiveness of the war government was shown by the rise of repeated demands for some sort of war cabinet or munitions ministry. It was not yet clear that the half-dozen war boards or administrations constituted this, for the War Industries Board, which was the central feature of co-ordination, was undergoing reorganization. When Senator Chamberlain declared in a public speech before the National Security League, January 19, that the war government had broken down, the storm of criticism

<sup>49</sup> David Lawrence, "The New Boss", in *Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 3, 1918, p. 24.

<sup>50</sup> A summary of actual dead-weight tonnage delivered to the Fleet Corporation may be found in *Emergency Fleet News*, Jan. 1, 1919, p. 1.

<sup>51</sup> William Hard, "'Expedition' for Ships", in *New Republic*, Dec. 1, 1917, p. 114.

broke out into the open. The President denounced the statement as untrue; and when the Chamberlain Bill for the creation of a munitions ministry was brought into Congress, he countered it with the demand expressed in the Overman Act for a grant of more sweeping powers whereby, for the period of the war, he might be able to break away from the restrictions of the old government, enlarge, merge, or abolish existing bureaus, and transfer appropriated funds as well as authorized functions from one department to another in his discretion.

Within the limits of the army, sweeping changes had already been made by the President in his capacity of commander-in-chief. The functions of the General Staff were reclassified, and related powers that had lost force through diffusion were concentrated in a few great offices. General Goethals became chief of the Storage and Traffic Service on December 28,<sup>52</sup> while Edward R. Stettinius became surveyor general of purchases, and chief of a Purchase and Supply Division.<sup>53</sup> A little later, on April 16, 1918, these two divisions were merged under General Goethals as the Purchase, Storage, and Traffic Division of the General Staff.<sup>54</sup>

When it became clear that no legislation similar to the Chamberlain Bill could pass Congress to impede the actions of the President as commander-in-chief, Willard was replaced by Baruch, and the War Industries Board entered upon the dominant period in its career.<sup>55</sup> When on May 20 the Overman Bill granted to the President the sweeping powers he demanded, he immediately released the War Industries Board from its dependence on the Council of National Defense, making it a separate and independent war administration.<sup>56</sup>

The structural function of the War Industries Board, which it never fully performed, but towards which it was continually devel-

<sup>52</sup> General Orders, no. 167, War Dept., Dec. 28, 1917; *Army and Navy Jour.*, Feb. 16, 1918, p. 939; *Washington Post*, Jan. 8, 1918, p. 2.

<sup>53</sup> G. O., no. 5, War Dept., Jan. 11, 1918; *Army and Navy Jour.*, Feb. 23, 1918, p. 978; *Washington Post*, Jan. 28, 1918, p. 3; *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Jan. 26, 1918, p. 1.

<sup>54</sup> *Rept. of the Chief-of-Staff*, 1919, pp. 117-147; General Orders, no. 36, War Dept., Apr. 16, 1918; *Army and Navy Jour.*, May 18, 1918, p. 1441; A. L. Scott, "Procurement of Quartermaster Supplies during the World War", in the *Historical Outlook*, Apr., 1920, pp. 133-138.

<sup>55</sup> *Second Ann. Rept. of the Council of National Defense*, 1918, p. 127. The functions of the W. I. B. are defined in the President's letter of Mar. 4, 1918. *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Third Ann. Rept. of the Council of National Defense*, 1919, p. 5. With this separation the period of greatest importance of the C. N. D. as an "administrative laboratory" was ended.

oping, was, that of clearing the requirements of the military programme in such priority as might best serve the military need, conserve the military productivity of the nation, and maintain the civilian population in a condition of efficiency. The Requirements Division of the board began to operate, with Alexander Legge as chairman, toward the end of March. Here in the theory of procurement, the army, navy, allies, Shipping Board, and Railroad Administration presented their tables of prospective requirements. In the Requirements Division the contracts involved were given clearance in accordance with the system of priorities of the Priorities Board, under the direction of Judge Edwin B. Parker. This board continued to develop and present, as information became available and needs apparent, comprehensive lists of priority, showing the relative importance of industries in the national defense.<sup>57</sup>

In cases of procurement in which the price had a vital relationship to either the production of the goods or the civilian consumption of the surplus, the deliberations of the Price-fixing Committee were drawn upon. Robert S. Brookings as chairman of this body drew his authority directly from the President rather than through the War Industries Board. Much of his data came from the Federal Trade Commission. The committee itself was a representative body including the chairman of the War Industries Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Tariff Commission, together with the Fuel Administrator and representatives of army and navy, labor, and agriculture. So far as food prices were fixed, they were established through the Food Administration.

As the military programme was expanded through the summer of 1918, the activities of these co-ordinating agencies were progressively increased. On March 20 the President summoned to conference at the White House the chiefs of the six greatest war agencies. Thereafter these met on Wednesdays with considerable regularity; the public press provided the informal group with a name—"the war cabinet".<sup>58</sup>

Other subsidiary functions were undertaken by the War Industries Board as needed. It was necessary to organize commodities sections to assist in the steady flow of goods, and to stimulate the conservation of all of them. Upon the Conservation Division fell the burden of this work, which its chairman, A. W. Shaw, had begun

<sup>57</sup> *New York Times*, Sept. 9, 1918, p. 1; *32d Ann. Rept. of the Interstate Commerce Commission*, p. 4.

<sup>58</sup> *American Review of Reviews*, Apr. 21, 1918, p. 351; *Washington Post*, Mar. 20, 1918, p. 2; *ibid.*, Mar. 21, 1918, p. 2; *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Mar. 20, 1918, p. 1; *ibid.*, Mar. 21, 1918, p. 1; *London Times*, Mar. 29, 1918, p. 4.

near the beginning of the war through the Commercial Economy Board of the Council of National Defense. The Conservation Division in consultation with the commodities sections, and the appropriate war service committees of the industries involved, worked out schedules of self-denial, curtailing the less essential industries, and producing economies in others through the elimination of non-essential lines. With the assistance of the Priorities Division, which could control the supply of steel as well as the priorities of transportation, fuel, and labor, it was possible to force compliance with the conservation programme. But the evidence shows that the industries concerned, with few exceptions, enforced the programme by voluntary rule.

With all the economies made possible through acute conservation, it was still difficult to meet the procurement needs. In May, 1918, Charles A. Otis organized a Resources and Conversion Section, under which he built up a system of regional advisers and local war-resources committees for the purpose of stimulating the conversion of industrial plants from non-essential manufacture to the filling of military needs. When the conversion of resources proved inadequate, Samuel P. Bush put together the Facilities Division,<sup>59</sup> in which, through the co-operation of all the agencies of government, plans were made for the actual creation of new facilities for war manufacture.

From an early period in the war the army and navy advanced to contractors for government account a large portion of the purchase price, in order to meet their needs for active capital. There were many other contractors, however, whose needs lay outside the limits of existing law. With the government in the field floating one Liberty Loan after another, the gross resources of available capital became dangerously small. In January, 1918, the Federal Reserve Board organized a series of capital issues committees in the federal reserve districts<sup>60</sup> to give advice respecting priority of importance among the numerous private appeals for funds. Congress was asked to legalize and strengthen this policy, with the result that the capital issues committees were specifically legalized on April 5, and the War Finance Corporation was created with a working capital of \$500,000,000, and with authority to raise more funds through the issue of bonds.<sup>61</sup> It was intended that the War Finance Corporation should lend these funds not to the manufac-

<sup>59</sup> *Official Bulletin*, Aug. 27, 1918, p. 3.

<sup>60</sup> *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, issued by the Federal Reserve Board at Washington, Feb. 1, 1918, IV. 73.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1, 1918, IV. 364.

turers directly, but to the federal reserve banks in order to cover loans made by these banks for the creation of new facilities for war

By April, 1918, most of the distinct agencies of the war government had been created, and many of them were overlapping in their earnestness, and duplicating each other's work as well as that of many of the peace-time departments of the government. Out of one of these conflicts of operation there was developing an agency for co-ordination that began to produce physical results early in the summer. On May 24, 1918, at the time of the separation of the War Industries Board under the Overman Act, the President wrote to Chairman Baruch requesting the preparation of a general conspectus or survey showing the state of progress from time to time in all the fields of activity, military or civilian.<sup>62</sup>

The conspectus desired by the President was entrusted by Baruch to Dean Edwin F. Gay of Harvard University. Gay had been associated with somewhat similar attempts early in the year. It had been discovered before the end of 1917 that the control of shipping was vital to the success of the war, and that it might be improved or hindered according as there was co-operation or overlapping among the Shipping Board, the War Industries Board, and the War Trade Board.

The United States Shipping Board, responsible for the operation of the ships it commandeered, requisitioned, or built, was bound to study the needs of commerce.<sup>63</sup> In February when the shipping crisis was at its crest, the Shipping Board created a Bureau of Planning and Statistics in charge of Gay.<sup>64</sup> The War Trade Board was at the same time making overlapping studies concerning the control of imports and exports by license, both as to the essential character of the imports and as to the probable destination of the exports. It was wise to conduct this business so as to keep ships sailing with full cargoes, as well as necessary ones. Professor Allyn A. Young and later W. M. Adriance had organized this work, and in February, 1918, it came within the field of interest of Gay, who was designated as the Shipping Board's representative on the War Trade Board, to "devote his attention principally to the consideration of import problems in their relation to the allocation and

<sup>62</sup> Z. L. Potter, "The Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics", in *Quarterly Publications* of the American Statistical Association, Mar., 1919, p. 275; Wesley C. Mitchell, "Statistics and Government", *ibid.*, p. 227; *Washington Post*, June 13, 1918, p. 1.

<sup>63</sup> Horace Secrist, "Statistics of the United States Shipping Board", in *Quarterly Publications* of the American Statistical Association, Mar., 1919, p. 236.

<sup>64</sup> *Second Ann. Rept. of the U. S. Shipping Bd.*, 1918, p. 74.

conservation of ships".<sup>65</sup> In the Council of National Defense there had been established at the beginning of the war a division of statistics under Dr. Leonard P. Ayres. A portion of this division was taken into the General Staff and commissioned as the statistical branch, in March, 1918; and the remainder was transferred about June 1 to the newly independent War Industries Board, and became its Division of Planning and Statistics under Gay. Thus, by June 1, Gay was already directing three independent bodies of statistical co-ordination. The Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics was his new agency for the preparation of the periodical conspectus of war activities, in the course of which it exerted quiet pressure to eliminate unnecessary duplication. By the end of the war it was performing real work, and on December 2 it was named by the President as the "authoritative and exclusive source" of economic data for the peace conference.

Between June and September, 1918, the war government reached its full development, upon the basis of "work or fight". This meant, as understood by both the civilian population and the war government, that all activities should be continued or abandoned with reference to the winning of the war. Before it could be attained, it was necessary that labor be brought within the limits of control. Labor in the World War was as much an arm of the military service as industry or capital or trade. The fighting forces were merely the cutting edge of the instrument, whose weight and depth and driving force depended upon the degree to which labor, industry, capital, and trade, were mobilized behind them. The co-operation of labor in this war was offered from the start through the mechanism of the American Federation of Labor, and Samuel Gompers, its chief. As early as March 12, 1917, it produced a general programme of co-operation and fought consistently to counteract the propaganda of the non-war Socialists, whose spokesman, Morris Hillquit, openly declared that "the country has been violently, needlessly, and criminally involved in war".<sup>66</sup> In close co-operation with the Committee on Public Information,<sup>67</sup> which the

<sup>65</sup> *War Trade Board Journal*, no. 7, Mar. 1, 1918, p. 3.

<sup>66</sup> *Milwaukee Leader*, Apr. 7, 1917, p. 1.

<sup>67</sup> George Creel was made chairman of this body, and, although commonly regarded as a sort of censor, he interpreted his function as that of procuring proper publicity and the creation of a sound public opinion based upon the facts. Certain powers connected with the censorship of cables were subsequently entrusted to him. The censorship of the press under the Espionage Act, Trading with the Enemy Act, and Sedition Act was entrusted largely to the Postmaster General. *Official Bulletin*, Oct. 27, 1917, p. 3; Creel, *How We Advertised America* (1920).



President organized on April 14, it used the resources of publicity to insure unanimity of patriotic conviction. When non-war agitators organized their propaganda society, the People's Council for Democracy and Terms of Peace,<sup>68</sup> the Federation organized, as a flying wing to manoeuvre against it, an American Alliance of Labor and Democracy.<sup>69</sup>

Nearly every one of the war boards or administrations found itself forced to establish a labor division and some sort of labor tribunal within its special field.<sup>70</sup> Commissions and wage boards were numerous and varied. As the winter of 1917-1918 approached, with the conviction general that only through conservation could the war be won, the Department of Labor underwent a searching reorganization in the development of a series of war labor services. A commission of citizens representing the American Federation of Labor on the one hand and the National Industrial Conference Board on the other, brought forward a programme for a National War Labor Board as a supreme court for labor controversies.<sup>71</sup> The assignment of ex-President Taft as one of the chairmen of this board gave a measure for the importance of its problem. A month later a War Labor Policies Board under Professor Felix Frankfurter undertook the task of laying down general rules for the government use of labor.<sup>72</sup>

The practical problem involved not only the use of labor but also the selection of men for military service. On May 17, 1918, the provost marshal general of the army ruled that deferred classification under the draft should not be allowed to registrants engaged in unimportant work.<sup>73</sup> His list of non-essential occupations produced a scurrying of men into real jobs. The completion of the organization of the war boards in the next few months made it possible for the national will to have a chance to be effectively carried out. On August 1, 1918, the United States Employment Service took over the monopoly of recruiting unskilled labor for industry. On the last day of August, Congress, having accepted

<sup>68</sup> *New York Call*, June 3, 1917, p. 7.

<sup>69</sup> *Milwaukee Leader*, June 18, 1917, p. 2; *New York Call*, July 31, 1917, p. 4; *New York Times*, Sept. 2, 1917, p. 3.

<sup>70</sup> *Third Ann. Rept. of the U. S. Shipping Bd.*, 1919, p. 85.

<sup>71</sup> *Washington Post*, Apr. 10, 1918, p. 3; *Congressional Record*, Apr. 16, 1918, p. 5121; *Official Bulletin*, Apr. 16, 1918, p. 8; *Survey*, Apr. 27, 1918, p. 100.

<sup>72</sup> *Monthly Review of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, June, 1918, p. 1418.

<sup>73</sup> *Second Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War on the Operations of the Selective Service System to December 20, 1918*, pp. 75-85; *Selective Service Regulations* (second ed., 1918), p. 85.

the programme of eighty divisions for the campaign of 1919, extended the draft ages to include eighteen to forty-five. A few days later the priorities division of the War Industries Board established a minute classification of industries in the order of their military importance and announced that the less important industries need not expect to receive fuel, steel, transportation, or labor until the most important were fully satisfied.<sup>74</sup>

By September, 1918, the organization of the American war government was complete. By the side of the normal civil agencies with restricted powers, it comprised a series of boards and administrations exercising dictatorial authority over economic and social matters.<sup>75</sup> It marked, in the term of eighteen months, a genuine attempt at a complete transition from the doctrine of individualism and free competition to one of centralized national co-operation which was properly symbolized in the pregnant phrase—"work or fight".

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

<sup>74</sup> *Official Bulletin*, Sept. 9, 1918, p. 1.

<sup>75</sup> *Handbook of Economic Agencies for the War of 1917* (monograph no. 3 of the Historical Branch, War Plans Division, General Staff, 1919) is an alphabetical guide to nearly three thousand separate agencies.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS

*The Idea of Progress: an Inquiry into its Origin and Growth.* By J. B. BURY, Regius Professor of Modern History, and Fellow of King's College, in the University of Cambridge. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1920. Pp. xv, 377. 14 sh.)

PROFESSOR BURY has given us a penetrating analysis, from the point of view of its origin and significance, of one of the fundamental assumptions or preconceptions of modern thought; an assumption taken so much for granted that we commonly ignore its existence. This is perhaps why, in spite of its manifest importance, it has been largely ignored by historians. Much has been written about "progress"; but on the "idea" of progress there is little of value except a penetrating essay by Brunetière and the thorough but somewhat mechanical survey by Delvaille (*Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Idée de Progrès*). Delvaille was prone to identify the modern notion of progress with any or all conceptions of change and improvement; so much so that he finds a kind of theory of progress in the Christian ideal of a future life. This was to defeat the very purpose of such a study by stretching the concept of progress to the point where it included its antithesis. Delvaille's book, as Professor Bury justly says, lacks discrimination.

This is just the chief merit of Professor Bury's book, that it discriminates with fine precision between what is essential to the modern conception of progress and what only superficially resembles it. The modern conception of progress rests on the belief that man can, by taking thought, add a cubit to his stature, or else that a cubit will be added whether he takes thought or not. It rests upon the assumption (1) that nature operates uniformly; (2) that man is, in some measure at least, the product of nature; and (3) either (a) that man can, by mastering the secrets of nature, shape his own destiny in harmony with his desires, or (b) that a natural process of evolution will inevitably lift him, whether he wills or knows it or not, to ever higher levels. Professor Bury shows with succinct perfection that some or all of these assumptions were foreign to classical and medieval thought. Classical thought was incurably pessimistic with respect to the future possibilities of the human race, conceiving that there is no new thing under the sun and that "time is the enemy of man". Medieval thought was equally pessimistic about man, conceiving him so little capable of progress or improvement that it had to bring in Providence, and the specially designed machinery of Church and Empire, to save his soul alive out of

hell. The modern idea of Progress was therefore impossible until the Cartesian and Newtonian philosophy established the notion of uniform natural law, and Locke's criticism of innate ideas seemed to make man the product of an environment that could be modified and indefinitely perfected with the increase of scientific knowledge. The great aim of the eighteenth century was to shape the ideas, the conduct, and the institutions of men in harmony with "nature"; that is, to discover, by reason, as Voltaire thought, or by consulting the instincts of the heart, as Rousseau thought, or by studying the customs and institutions of men, throughout the world and in the past—by all of these means to discover those ideas and institutions that were most universal and hence most in accord with the "nature" of man. "What I have sought", said Montesquieu, "is man in general." This is what the eighteenth century did—it went about with the lantern of enlightenment in search of man in general, convinced that the perfectibility of particular men depended upon their adopting the ideas and the institutions that were suited to man in general. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars gave most people a marked aversion for man in general. "I have seen Frenchmen, Italians, Russians", said Joseph de Maistre, "but as for man, I declare I never met him in my life: if he exists he is unknown to me." This scepticism was deep seated in nineteenth-century thought; and accordingly, if it did not abandon the dream of progress, it relied for it rather more upon an impersonal historic process, in which the "real was the rational and the rational was the real", than upon the deliberate effort of man to shape his own destiny.

It is possible that Professor Bury has not brought out this difference between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century ideas as sharply as it deserves; but his exposition of the significance of the idea of Progress in the history of European civilization is so lucid that it leaves nothing to be desired. It is no accident that the belief in Progress and a concern for "posterity" waxed in proportion as the belief in Providence and a concern for a future life waned; the former belief—illusion if you prefer—is man's compensation for the loss of the latter. "The hope of an ultimate happy state on this planet, to be enjoyed by future generations, has replaced, as a social power, the hope of felicity in another world." Professor Bury might have quoted the pregnant phrase of Diderôt: "La postérité pour le philosophe, c'est l'autre monde de l'homme religieux."

CARL BECKER.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediæval England: the Wardrobe, the Chamber, and the Small Seals.* By T. F. Tout, M.A., F.B.A., Professor of History in the University of Manchester. Volumes I. and II. [Publications of the University

of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXXIV.] (Manchester: University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. xxiv, 317; xvi, 364. \$7.00 each.)

THE importance of administration in English history has long been obscured by the prevailing tendency to regard Parliament rather than government as the central theme of national development. And yet it was known to Stubbs, even better to Maitland, that the administrative system contained in the king's household was a seat of power, which was ever the special object of baronial and parliamentary attack. It was also apparent that the king's council was the embodiment of the domestic as well as the feudal principle of government. What then was the king's household and its place in the state during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? It remained for a French scholar, M. Déprez, in a suggestive treatise on the small seals, to point the way to this productive field of research. The study of seals led to records, and the records to official departments, wherein rested the *curial*, in distinction from the public or national, administration. Among several contributions of note, that of Professor Tout, *The Place of Edward II. in History* (1914), gave a forecast of the great work, of which two of the prospective four volumes are now before us. With no claim to the field of diplomatics, it undertakes first a comprehensive survey of the administration connected with the household, and then an intensive study of the inner offices and their methods of business. It opens a new view of English history, and as an authority upon its special subject the work stands alone.

In the discovery and treatment of material the problem in hand differs entirely from that in France, where under an autocratic monarchy a single unified chancery was evolved. The English system, on the other hand, was complex, wherein the king, as if driven from one line of entrenchment to another, set up various departments independent of each other, so that the records of exchequer, chancery, privy seal, and wardrobe are the product of diverse and often conflicting usage. A most valuable feature of Professor Tout's book therefore will be found in the luminous exposition of sources and authorities as set forth in a descriptive chapter on documentary material. Apart from its immediate purpose this should serve as a supplement to every existing guide to the public records. Certain illustrative documents also have been newly printed, among them the earliest wardrobe account (1224-1227), and a household ordinance of 1279. If there be any lack in the use of sources it seems to lie in the Memoranda Rolls of the Exchequer, which every investigator laments cannot be read thoroughly without the aid of printed calendars.

In general the household is depicted as the original home of all departments of administration. By steps barely traceable there went forth first the treasury and exchequer, and later the chancery. But that did

not preclude the king's chamber, the early treasure-room of the household, from continuing its function of receiving and disbursing a considerable part of the royal revenue. The real discovery of the book comes with the wardrobe, which rose from a subdivision of the chamber to be the principal financial department of the household. More mobile than the chamber, it followed the king on his campaigns and so became the special treasury of military expenditures. As the keepers rendered account, an intimate knowledge of its operations is made possible. After the methods of the age, these accounts are precise in detail and full of instructive minutiae, but because of the confusion of arrearages with current items all totals and summaries are misleading. The sums thus handled averaged as much as £50,000 a year in the time of Edward II., but it was impossible for the king himself ever to know the exact state of his income.

Still more remarkable is the revelation of the wardrobe as a secretarial department in connection with its custody of the privy seal. It was a unique feature of English administration that, instead of a reduplication of the great seal, for the convenience of an itinerant sovereign a lesser seal was adopted. As the chancery was by degrees removed from court, and as it became highly formalized in its operations and even put under constitutional restrictions, the utility of the minor seal was increased, until the two seals were expressive of rival systems. A certain confusion is now eliminated by the discovery that the original keeper of the privy seal was the controller of the wardrobe, who was also known as "secretary" under Edward I. In support of the theory first advanced by Déprez and subsequently disputed, new evidence is adduced to show that there was a method of enrollment of letters of the privy seal (vol. II., p. 80). It is remarkable however that no rolls of the sort have survived, and in view of the fact that letters of the privy seal are more frequently mentioned as kept in files, while writs like the subpoena were expressly objected to on the ground that they were not enrolled (*Rot. Parl.*, IV. 84), we are still free to believe that any enrollment of privy seals was either a temporary or an exceptional expedient. In the case of lesser lords, it is true, letters of both seals were commonly enrolled, but that proves nothing with respect to the king, who alone maintained two separate offices.

With clearness and originality there is apt to be excessive positiveness. In points of controversy the author occasionally falls into the temptation of exaggeration by over-stating an opposing view in order the more sharply to challenge it. Thus the latest historian of the council hardly went so far, in word or intent, as to represent that body as "an executive office" or "a branch of the administration", nor is it to be admitted that the system perfected only in Tudor times was to this extent anticipated (vol. I., p. 11; vol. II., p. 147). Still less satisfaction is felt with the view of Professor Tout himself that "Advisory and

executive functions approach most nearly in the permanent king's council which was *always at his side* to help him in dealing with problems of government. . . . But the real function of the council was to give advice." This appears to ignore the essential fact that the council was at an early date withdrawn from court, and that, while there remained councillors with the king, the principal branch of the organized body was given a home among the courts at Westminster. Its participation in administration and judicature was not the less real by being in the form of advice. The Tudors afterwards reversed this order by reviving and strengthening its connection with the household.

Far from being wholly institutional, the work is replete with biographical notices of bishops, barons, chancellors, keepers, and clerks. It reveals the wardrobe as the particular training-ground of a virtual civil service and an incipient bureaucracy. In the revolutionary period of Edward II. it traverses familiar ground. The net results of the baronial opposition were the depression of the wardrobe, the temporary revival of the chamber, and the removal of the privy seal from court. The further development of the small seals under Edward III. and Richard II. promises to be no less interesting, and the completion of the work to the revolution of 1399 will be eagerly awaited.

JAMES F. BALDWIN.

*Codice Diplomatico dei Re Aragonesi di Sicilia, Pietro I., Giacomo, Federico II., Pietro II. e Ludovico, dalla Rivoluzione Siciliana del 1282 sino al 1355, con Note Storiche e Diplomatiche.* Per GIUSEPPE LA MANTIA. Volume I., Anni 1282-1290. [Documenti per servire alla Storia di Sicilia pubblicati a cura della Società Siciliana per la Storia Patria. Prima serie, Diplomatica, vol. XXIII.] (Palermo: Boccone del Povero. 1917. Pp. ccxv, 698.)

THE records of the Aragonese dominion in Sicily were once extremely rich, combining as they did the administrative traditions of two of the earliest and most fully developed bureaucracies in Europe, yet such have been the effects of war and transfer and neglect that relatively little remains in Sicily itself. At Barcelona, on the contrary, the archives of the crown of Aragon are, for the last two and a half centuries of the Middle Ages, among the fullest in Europe, as scholars of other countries have begun to learn particularly through the publications of Finke; and all who have had occasion to examine their long series of registers and *cartas sueltas* can testify to their admirable order and no less admirable administration. One could guess in advance that this rich store is the most important source of Cav. La Mantia's stout volume, in spite of his long researches at Palermo and in other Sicilian repositories. The great gap results from the loss of the registers of the Sicilian administration, save for a volume of 1282-1283 which had

AM HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—6.



the good fortune to be carried to Catalonia, where it was transcribed by Carini and published in 1882, and certain fragments of 1353-1355 discovered by La Mantia himself. His earnest labors to collect the materials for the intervening years will be appreciated by all students of the period.

It is not the editor's fault if his volume brings to light less that is new than does such a collection as the *Acta Aragonensia* of Finke. On the Sicilian side the period of the Vespers and the critical years which follow have been the subject of research from early times to the recent substantial monograph of Otto Cartellieri, while Carini took the freshness away from much of the material in Spain. Only documents of special importance are reprinted, but all are carefully analyzed, with elaborate annotation and citation of modern writers, who are also treated at length in the introduction. One is disposed to criticize the reproduction of no. 13 (*cf.* no. 15) from Rymer's text of 1727, when a photograph could easily have been obtained from the Record Office for collation. There is the usual considerable number of forgeries, chiefly genealogical, which plague every student of the Sicilian charters of the Middle Ages. Legal procedure is illustrated, as well as general diplomatic and military history, and several documents throw light on commercial relations. Perhaps the most interesting texts are two detailed accounts of the receipts and expenditures of the admiral of Aragon for 1283 and 1285-1287, preserved in the archives of the cathedral of Valencia, whence they were printed by Huici in an out-of-the-way Spanish review in 1914-1915. The editor is to be thanked for republishing these, with a more careful text and fuller annotation (nos. 222, 241), as well as a summarized statement of the account, the whole affording an illustration of the enormous amount of valuable information which is still locked up in the fiscal documents of the Middle Ages, and causing us to lament the loss of earlier Sicilian accounts. The receipts cover supplies as well as money, and one item (p. 600) is "from various pirates for the right of the fifth (*quinta*) of the spoil and other property acquired by them in the exercise of piracy".

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*Les Étrangers en France sous l'Ancien Régime.* Par J. MATHOREZ, Membre du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques. Tome I. *Les Causes de la Pénétration des Étrangers en France; les Orientaux et les Extra-Européens dans la Population Française.* [Histoire de la Formation de la Population Française.] (Paris: Édouard Champion. 1919. Pp. viii, 437. 35 fr.)

ACCEPTING as conclusively demonstrated by the cumulative evidence of anthropology, ethnology, and archaeology the basic complexity of the French race, M. Mathorez waives the conventional obligation to "begin at the beginning", adjourns the consideration of origins, and,

confining himself to the period following the emergence of the modern nations, addresses himself to a corollary problem, that of showing how the basic conglomerate has been affected by the addition of extraneous racial elements. For such a task he is amply qualified by prolonged and profound research in this special field, the results of which have from time to time appeared in monographs. The present volume is the first of a series which, when completed, will undoubtedly constitute one of the most important and authoritative works on French demography in recent years. Citations in the greatest variety and profusion, from departmental and municipal archives, local histories, family registers, memoirs, university rolls, police records, and a hundred and one other sources, witness to an encyclopedic range of investigation.

"La population française est essentiellement alluvionnaire", says the author (p. vii). The evidence already accumulated and here presented is sufficient to establish the thesis. In this first volume we have traced in minute detail the streams of immigration from eastern Europe, and from non-European races—the more or less continuous flow of Poles, Hungarians, Russians, Greeks, and the intermittent infiltration of Saracens, Moors, Turks, Armenians, Persians, Syrians, "Gypsies", Indians, negroes, and Orientals. From the greatest variety of motives they come: in pursuit of trade; as soldiers of fortune; seekers after learning and culture; on errands of religion; fleeing from persecution; in the train of prince or ambassador; or simply "for to admire and for to see". And each element makes its contribution to the race and its life, and leaves somewhere its mark, in language or lineaments or custom. For France is hospitable, and the French temperament is receptive and assimilative. "The French have never been xenophobes, and very rarely have they manifested nationalism in the special sense which the word has acquired in the nineteenth-century political vocabulary" (p. 132). "There never has been a period of fifty years in which the inhabitants of the country have not undergone a foreign influence which resulted in modifying their tastes and ideas" (p. 129). As to the extent and permanence and the ethnic effects of this influence the author reserves judgment, pending a fuller induction (p. 151). Elsewhere, however, he seems to give a hint of his conclusion: "A people that possesses in so high a degree as ours the sentiment of national unity will have no fear that its genius and traditions will be transformed by the intrusion of some hundreds of thousands of foreigners"; "their invincible faith in the immortality of their fatherland assures them that they cannot be subjugated by even a continuous infiltration of alluvial elements" (p. 132)—no chauvinistic flourish, but sober judgment, corroborated by the observation and experience of everyone who pretends to a knowledge of France and the French.

But however jealously guarding the peculiar treasure of her genius, France has long stood in need of these *alluvions*. "Indispensable to the

vitality of our country", says Mathorez; and, further, "If the kingdom had not continually received foreigners who became merged into the population, one would readily have perceived a considerable diminution in the subjects of the king" (p. 3). There is no more arresting sentence in the entire volume; nor any portion of his work more thought-provoking than that in which the author discusses depopulation under the Old Régime. A people who increased but a million and a half, less than six per cent., in four hundred and fifty years (1328-1778), only 3300 a year! was plainly in need of constant recruitment from without (pp. 16-21). The earlier centuries were seemingly unaware of the drift, or accepted a high mortality with a fatalistic shrug. The eighteenth century had fewer illusions about the "ways of Providence"; philosophers, economists, officials, and churchmen sensed the danger, sounded a warning, and sought for a remedy. A hundred and fifty years before Bertillon, Levasseur, and Leroy-Beaulieu, this spectre of a declining birth-rate was agitating Condorcet, Montesquieu, Mirabeau, and Buffon. No doubt there were optimists then as now, who argued from the continuity of history "France has always been; she will continue to be"; or who counted upon the miraculous gift of assimilation, the "power of France to make French whatever comes to her". *Eh bien*; the problem still remains, and to-day the danger is more acute than ever! It were well for the optimists of the present to ponder the warning of Leroy-Beaulieu: "Dépopulation prochaine ou dénationalisation prochaine de la France, s'il ne se produit un revirement prompt et décisif de la mentalité française, voilà la dilemme; voilà la destinée qu'on peut regarder comme inéluctable" (*La Question de la Population*, 1913, p. 365).

THEODORE COLLIER.

*The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: a Study of their Politics, Civil Life, and Government, 1558-1580, from the Fall of the Old Church to the Advent of the Counter-Reformation.* By JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. xi, 387. \$7.50.)

THIS is apparently a scholar's book, and, if we regard the preface as the serious opinion of the author, to his thinking one much needed in a dry and thirsty land where little cultivation had been attempted. Father Pollen informs us that he is attempting to lay down principles, to provide fundamental points of judgment for students and readers, and it is therefore essential to view his volume from a somewhat different point of view than that of a narrative history. The soundness of his assumptions, the critical value of his judgments, are certainly for us to consider. From this point of view, his title and his first sentence will surprise many students. He begins his story with "the fall of the Old

Church in 1558". Obviously the Catholic Church did not fall under Henry VIII.! Does he infer that the Reformation did not begin under Henry? Does he presume that no events of real importance took place before 1558? Does he propose to treat the reign of Elizabeth as the real breach with Rome, and the acts of Henry as an internal reformation within the Church itself? If so, he is laying down a principle in Catholic history which will be new to many and the significance of which will reach far. It is perhaps as well to call attention to the fact that this book bears the official imprimatur of the Catholic Church in England. If this is to be the position of "the English Catholic Church" in regard to the history of the Reformation, it is an exceedingly important position. The first sentence confirms this: "When Elizabeth came to the throne, she found herself face to face with the venerable Church which St. Augustine had founded close on a thousand years before, which had grown with the people and had become an integral part of the national life". Needless to add, there is not a word in that sentence which has not been actively controverted, not merely by Protestants, but by Catholics.

Father Pollen continues his story to the year 1580—"to the advent of the Counter-Reformation". He proposes therefore to regard the militant movement of Allen and the Jesuits as a literal counter-reformation of the Church in England. He tells us that this period marks "the return to life of the Old Church". He infers therefore that what was attempted in 1580 was what actually succeeded. He really proposes to date the continuous history of the Catholic Church now in England from the militant movement inaugurated by Parsons; certainly from the secular movement inaugurated by Allen. His own studies have made clear to us that he realizes, as others have, that in 1580 there was, in the old sense of the word, no Catholic organization in England at all. There were no bishops; no recognition of papal authority in any formal way; and there was instituted at that time merely the missionary organization of the Jesuits and the few seculars. If this be the "return" of the "Old Church", the importance of the acceptance of such "principles" and "conclusions" will be obvious to the least experienced.

If that be his notion of the Old Church, many will question it. And why, again, should he write of the *return* of what obviously does not *continue*? If in Father Pollen's opinion the continuity of life of the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages was not interfered with by the acts of Henry VIII. and by the reform legislation of Edward VI., it is difficult to see the basis of his contention that the real destruction of the Church was accomplished by Elizabeth. That a very real continuity of life among English Catholics persisted from before the reign of Henry to the present day, there are few who will be prepared to deny. The men who believed in the Pope in England in the reign of Elizabeth were numerous, and an actual continuity of Catholic life was a fact.

Father Pollen attempts to show that throughout this period the Church disappeared for about twenty years. Surely there is some difficulty here in his principles; some further need of definition. The majority who have studied the organization of the English Church under Elizabeth have concluded with no great difficulty that the final organization accepted by English Catholics does not date from Elizabeth's reign at all. The historical movement which led actually to the establishment of bishops is more likely subsequent to 1610 than preceding it, and under any circumstances is not, by the majority of secular Catholics, dated earlier than the Wisbech Stirs of the last decade of Elizabeth's reign—a good fifteen years subsequent to the success of the "Counter-Reformation", if that is what Father Pollen means by the word "advent". Certainly, if the life of the Old Church began again in 1580, the secular movement for the institution of bishops becomes a detail of relative unimportance; the true work was already performed. The majority of students have not accepted such conclusions. Protestants and Catholic alike have seen the institution of bishops not established until 1623, and decline to accept the institution of a formal organization of Catholic laymen until the normal Catholic episcopal organization had come into existence.

The real question raised by Father Pollen seems to be: "What is or was Catholic organization and parties in England during the reign of Elizabeth?" If we take the broad sweep of the story and count as Catholics all those who thought of themselves at that time as Catholics, we shall have a very different story to trace than that thus sketched for us by Father Pollen. His title again states, and his preface confirms it, that his book is a study of the "politics, civil life, and government of the Catholics in England". One would expect to find an internal history of Catholic parties with the relationship of Catholic individuals to each other and a reasonably lengthy examination of the extent to which the older episcopal organization, or parish organization, was continued secretly through this period. There is, no doubt, in the book much information which bears on these points, but it cannot be honestly said that Father Pollen has addressed himself consciously to the solution of these issues. He has provided a readable account of the history of these twenty years, dealing with the rising of the North, the Bull of Excommunication, conflicts with foreign Catholics, and the like, from the point of view of the general premises just mentioned. An internal history of Catholic organization such as Father Pollen might write would be exceptionably valuable, but this book does not contain it. One is also led to question somewhat the ultimate designation of the book when one finds Father Pollen feeling it necessary to remind scholars to beware of the summary printed in the *Calendars of State Papers* and to read the manuscripts themselves. The criticism of the editing of the *Calendars* is again gratuitous, if true. The importance of such a volume as

this, announcing such premises and conclusions, from the pen of as well known an author as Father Pollen, is impossible to overstate, but Catholics as well as Protestants will do well to examine what his true contentions are.

ROLAND G. USHER.

*Henry Fox, First Lord Holland, his Family and Relations.* By the Earl of ILCHESTER. In two volumes. (London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. xv, 365; xi, 391. 32 sh.)

It is not great statesmen always who make political history or shape political standards; and the importance of Henry Fox is well known to anyone familiar with eighteenth-century England. Thus a well-rounded life of the man who with Sir Robert Walpole shares the distinction of having shown the greatest talent in parliamentary management in the days of the unreformed House of Commons fills a patent void in our historical records. The reviewer's own work<sup>1</sup> may perhaps have adequately portrayed his importance, and little fresh light is shed on the Newcastle ministry of which Fox was a main pillar, but the former work was necessarily meagre in its account of the less prominent periods of his career, for a study of which Lord Ilchester has drawn profitably from the Holland House and other manuscripts, inaccessible to the American scholar. The present work is the sixth that has appeared from that marvellous storehouse.

Unlike the reviewer's book, Lord Ilchester's volumes are strictly a biography. One might feel at times that Fox's associates are little more than shadows in the background of the hero's portrait; but the character and activities of the statesman himself are interestingly unfolded on almost every page. The subject is also presented with studied impartiality; and one may even question the statement that "the world regarding Fox as Orford's disciple was prone to view his methods with suspicion". No one, not even Pitt, attacked the corrupt machine-methods of the time, and Ilchester has elsewhere placed the unpopularity of Fox on more solid grounds—his association with the hated Duke of Cumberland, his abandonment of a promising career in order to fill a lucrative position of secondary importance, and, later, his identification with the ministry of Bute. Lord Ilchester, like every good Britisher, is an admirer of Pitt, and deals gently with that staunch patriot's political sins and shortcomings; but Fox himself is, after all, the best *exposeur* of his rival's limitations; and his comparison of Chatham with Sunderland (vol. II., p. 311) is one of the many interesting gleanings from the Holland House manuscripts.

<sup>1</sup> [*Henry Fox, First Lord Holland: a Study of the Career of an Eighteenth-Century Politician*, by Thad W. Riker (two volumes, Oxford, 1911); see *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XVII. 823-824. Ed.]

There is still much to be learned about Fox's early life. Little is known of his youth, or his first marriage (Ilchester even doubts its reality, but wrongly chaffs the reviewer instead of G. E. C.'s *Peerage* for "christening" the lady "Penelope"), or his relations with Walpole, his political teacher. One is a little more surprised that not more is added to our knowledge of Fox's own management of the Commons—especially his work of corrupting it for the Peace. But his activities at the Pay Office, where he (quite legitimately, be it said) harvested a fortune out of an expensive war, are described fully and instructively. In this connection Lord Ilchester makes the interesting point that Fox's determination to keep his position notwithstanding Bute's retirement was actuated largely by the fear that if an enemy became head of the Treasury the intricate machinery for adjusting his accounts might be interfered with under the new paymaster. It should be added that the author acquits him of having used the War Office for personal enrichment.

Despite his garbling of Admiral Byng's defense (which the author has discovered) Fox displayed singular honesty of a certain type. "His promise was inviolable, and men trusted him." His devotion to his family was also proverbial; and much is justly made of his loyalty to his friends—not only his most pleasing trait, but one that stands out the more clearly from the ingratitude of his own henchmen. (It is interesting to notice that Fox came to single out Bute as peculiarly fair and trustworthy.) Some pages are devoted at the close of the book to Fox's taste in art and letters; and the author has discovered that it was his son Stephen, and not Charles James, with whom Voltaire became acquainted. No details of Fox's own meeting with Voltaire have yet come to light.

Restrictions of space prevent even a selection of the new bits of information afforded by these volumes; but the author has certainly accomplished an exhaustive undertaking, and inaccuracies are negligible. The style, though hardly smooth, is not unpleasing.

T. W. RIKER.

*Geschichte des Neuern Schweizerischen Staatsrechts.* VON EDUARD HIS, Privatdozent der Rechte an der Universität Basel. Band I. *Die Zeit der Helvetik und der Vermittlungsakte 1798 bis 1813.* (Basel: Helbing und Lichtenbahn. 1920. Pp. xix, 691.)

THIS volume covers a period which has hitherto been studied more thoroughly in its political aspects than for its legal and constitutional development. The Helvetic Republic was a short-lived experiment born of the French Revolution. The Swiss patriots who called it into being were imbued with imported ideals unacceptable to the mass of the people and ill adapted to the historic situation. A unit state constructed out of unwilling members of an age-long confederation became impossible, and



Napoleon's Act of Mediation restored the old federal system with numerous improvements. The fall of Bonaparte was followed by a period of reaction, then modern liberal movements began again about 1830, leading to the present federal system in 1848.

How much the Helvetic and Napoleonic era contributed to the modern state is a question the answer to which forms a part of the author's task, but his labors are more fully devoted to the sources of the prevailing political theories and to the forms which those principals assumed in the consecutive constitutions which ruled between 1798 and 1813. The story is presented with great elaboration in nearly seven hundred pages, fortified with extensive notes and citations.

The first chapter gives a rapid review of the external constitutional history of the period, showing the relation of the Swiss movement to the other written constitutions of the eighteenth century, and depicting the men and measures which introduced the changes in the confederation. The work then proceeds to consider one by one the great principles of constitutional construction in the twenty and more chapters which follow. This plan causes a chronological retreat for each subject, but without unnecessary repetition. For example, the theory of the balance of powers is traced in the cantons of the old confederation, then in the writings of Locke and Montesquieu, in the American states and the Union, and finally in the constitutions of the French Revolution and Directory. The adaptations of the prevailing theory to the Helvetic Republic and the Napoleonic modifications, both in France and Switzerland, are thus explained in the light of the political thinking of the time on that one theme.

In the same manner declarations of rights, popular sovereignty, representation, the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, equality before the law, religious liberty, freedom of the press, right of assembly, right of petition, the obligations of taxation, education, military service, and other topics are displayed in their eighteenth-century setting. The brief historical reviews of Swiss conditions often reach further back and are particularly satisfactory in the chapters on religion and citizenship. The modern institutions of Switzerland cannot be properly appreciated without a long look into the past.

The author makes no claim that the Helvetic Republic was the beginning of modern Swiss politics, but argues that it opened the way to a new conception of the state as an active force for progress. Hitherto it had been simply the power which retained things as they were, its duties fulfilled in holding on to the past. The unit state was such a political mistake, and made more unbearable by the greedy actions of the French revolutionary missionaries, that reconciliation to the idea of government with progressive duties was long postponed. The men who engineered the Republic had to go into retirement or, like Pestalozzi and Fallenberg, devote themselves to the reform of education, but some

of them lived to witness the movements of 1830 which heralded the liberation of the voter and the enlargement of the functions of government.

J. M. VINCENT.

*Lord Grey of the Reform Bill, being the Life of Charles, Second Earl Grey.* By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. xiv, 413. \$7.00.)

THE difficulty before a reviewer in connection with this book is to explain why it cannot be classified readily. It is not a biography of Lord Grey; or at least such an imperfect biography, that it would be unfair to judge of it as in that category. Nor is it a history of the Reform Bill; or at least it is such an incomplete history that it would be invidious to place it in contrast to the well-known standard works on that subject. Being then neither a biography nor a history, its classification must be sought in the circumstances of its origin. Every prime minister of the nineteenth century, save Lord Grey, has earned an authentic, and in some cases what passes for an official biography, within a few years after the close of his career. Lord Grey is singular in having so far been neglected by a political biographer. His character and achievements have been gauged adequately; but they have never been brought within a separate binding, having Lord Grey's name on the outside. It was to end this singularity that Mr. Trevelyan was asked to undertake this book.

The result may be best described as a volume by Mr. Trevelyan with Lord Grey's name on the outside. For the proportion of the text of 369 pages bearing directly upon Grey is too slight to give unity to the whole, and too scattered for focusing into any but a vague image. A little reflection upon the making of the book suggests the conclusion that Grey was rather a shadowy figure in Mr. Trevelyan's mind—shadowy within the living panorama in which Grey himself lived—an era which Mr. Trevelyan sees otherwise with vividness. For Mr. Trevelyan inherits with passionate partizanship the stern, uncompromising Liberal-Radical tradition of the nineteenth century, a tradition which interprets the dark days of Tory reaction and the gloomy ending of the Georgian epoch with an embittered dissent from the orthodox Tory view. It is not the purpose of this criticism to take issue with Mr. Trevelyan upon the merits of the political creed which he proclaims, and which he reads into the period he has surveyed so pointedly. But it is perhaps necessary to explain to intending readers of the book that Mr. Trevelyan writes within the narrow vision of his creed, so that his work has all the intensive force and all the obvious shortcomings of an angry and protesting sectarian, determined to contrive a moral at the expense of a rival tradition. For this is what Mr. Trevelyan's volume really is: an

indictment of Tory administration during the era in which Grey lived—an indictment conceived in the unmeasured violence of a political antagonist.

Anyone whose political convictions are of the same order will find his own views of the period from 1789 to 1832 abundantly fortified by this latest survey. For Mr. Trevelyan, although the unpublished correspondence of Grey gave him little scope for a distinctive contribution from new material, has made excellent use of most of the published works of the last fifteen years—particularly of the three notable books of Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, with their extensive research into the Home Office Papers. Anyone, again, who desires to understand the Liberal-Radical interpretation of this period, particularly its detestation of Pitt, will find this book peculiarly forceful. Anyone anticipating a work of judicious scholarship will probably share the reviewer's disappointment, for the general effect is to make the tradition of Burke and Pitt, of Castlereagh, Canning, and Wellington, appear contemptible rather than intelligible. There will be difference of opinion as to whether or not this was the best service to render to the memory of Grey. Also there will be difference of opinion as to whether or not Mr. Trevelyan's over-emphasis of the personal responsibility of the leaders of Tory reaction does the best service to a present school of statesmanship which, on its historical side, is perhaps too ready to attribute to a few distinguished Tories the original failure to solve the problems of industrial dislocation and class antagonism at their first critical appearance after the Industrial Revolution.

C. E. FRYER.

*Brief History of the Great War.* By CARLTON J. H. HAYES, Professor of History in Columbia University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1920. Pp. xiv, 461. \$3.50.)

THIS is the best single-volume history of the Great War which has so far appeared, and it is one of the very few which deserve serious consideration by professional students of history. It is written with a high degree of scientific responsibility, and not for mere purposes of journalism or propaganda. It covers the entire period of the war from the Serbian note to the Treaty of Versailles with reasonable fullness, and there are not many places where it can be criticized for the amount of space assigned to the various major events. Finally, it is written in a thoroughly readable, not to say spirited style.

Of course whether this volume or any other like it will seem of first-class historical value, a few years from now, remains entirely in the lap of the gods. Not merely will our judgment on a great number of happenings be subject to drastic revision as time inevitably changes our viewpoints—*e.g.*, as to many Balkan, Slavic, or economic matters—but we also are now manifestly at the mere beginning of a long succession

of "revelations", official and personal, which, while they may not swerve our judgment as to the greater things, will assuredly modify current statements as to many important secondary matters. The published apologiae of such worthies as Ludendorff, Tirpitz, etc., are of course mere forewords to many more significant rejoinders by the *advocati diaboli*, while we have hardly as yet received any of the elaborate and less contentious material we shall surely obtain from high British, French, Italian, not to say American, sources. Certainly, too, all our chancelleries will pretty soon become less jealous in safeguarding what were once confidential despatches. The access to power of a strongly anti-Wilsonian administration in this country, or of a pronounced Labor ministry in Britain, would probably be followed by the release of a great mass of diplomatic and even military correspondence, the publication whereof the present custodians would loudly deprecate.

Even as things stand, Professor Hayes seems to have sent away his last proofs before he could make use of such interesting commentaries as Bernstorff's *My Three Years in America*, Czernin's defensive memoirs, or Sir Philip Gibbs's *Now it Can be Told*, with its light upon the seamy side of the war. To take very ordinary events, it does not seem probable that the whole truth about the *Lusitania*, the resignation of Mr. Bryan, the exit of Dr. Dumba, or the inwardness of the Zimmermann note to Mexico has yet been told in this or in any other book. Nor, if we cross the Atlantic, do we feel that we are at the bottom of such problems as why "Tino" of Greece was allowed to stay so long in Athens; why Rumania was cast away in 1916; how far the Teutonophiles around the Tsar intrigued for a separate peace in 1916-1917; what was the part played by the Vatican in the various attempts to rescue Austria from the maelstrom of war; or what was the real story of the rather elaborate peace negotiations in Switzerland during the winter of 1917-1918. As for military matters (to select a random example from a legion) it is still a matter for prolonged argument whether Nivelle was an over-rated braggart or a skillful though unfortunate general.

Such points Professor Hayes in no wise attempts to settle finally, although he usually suggests the current orthodox explanations. However, though it is likely enough that many of his statements are subject to future amplification, they will very seldom need correction. Two thousand years hence sundry pundits will doubtless descant learnedly upon the First and Second Marnes, and upon the dramatic achievements of Ferdinand Foch. The military and political outlines of the Great War can never be essentially different from those the author has given them, and the present age cannot be asked to wait for the philosophic retrospects of a Grote or a Mommsen. It may be safely stated that few histories of our Civil War written about 1867 have stood the ordeal of later revelations and criticism, so well as this history is likely to go through the next four decades.

The story of the war is told in fifteen rather long chapters, interpreted by ten large and thirty-nine smaller maps. The first chapter contains a small section taken from the author's well-known *Political and Social History of Modern Europe* and suggests rather familiar lines of thought, but when the narrative is fairly started the author cuts loose from his earlier undertaking, and writes not a well-balanced textbook, but a really spirited history calculated to appeal to the oft-abused "general reader". The economic factor does not receive the pronounced stress possibly to be expected from a leading member of the so-called "Columbia school", and indeed industrial and economic aspects of the war might well have been developed at somewhat greater length. Such chapters as those treating of the Russian collapse and the great Ludendorff drive in 1918 stand about every test whether considered as scientific or as very well narrated "popular" history.

Almost inevitably the least complete part of the volume is that dealing with the participation of the United States. Professor Hayes had to choose between stating opinions as to Mr. Wilson's policies, our years of neutrality, the League of Nations, etc., which would be pretty sure to offend a large fraction of his readers, whatever views he took, or giving us some rather colorless chapters. He chose the latter alternative, possibly wisely. Theodore Roosevelt, and his service in rousing the nation to its supreme duty at a time when our official leaders sounded no clarions, receives, I believe, only one, entirely passing, reference. It is a reasonable inference that the author is a profound admirer of Mr. Wilson and his policies, and that he is not unwilling to be called an "internationalist", but this is an inference not to be proved by specific texts. Nevertheless it is noticeable how full of freedom and verve is the treatment, *e.g.*, of Kerensky, and how gingerly is that of the "extraordinary opposition [to the League Covenant] from the Republican majority of the Senate". This merely illustrates the difficulty of speaking out one's full mind before one's own countrymen.

As an indictment of Hohenzollernism and its works, and a justification of the Allied and American advocates of "Peace through Victory" this book is invaluable, not because of its epithets but because of its careful and cumulative use of probative material. Thanks to the relatively ample space assigned to diplomatic and political events, and not merely to battles, it is a far more useful general guide to five momentous years of history, than the recent volume of Professor Pollard, about its only serious competitor. There are a few obvious errors, *e.g.*, about the area of Austria (p. 383), but they are of small import.

To sum up: this book must doubtless be rewritten say within five years, but at present it holds practically a unique place for fullness of information, fairness, balance, and accuracy.

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

*History of the Great War based on Official Documents, by Direction of the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence: Naval Operations.* By Sir JULIAN S. CORBETT. Volume I. *To the Battle of the Falklands, December, 1914. Maps to accompany Volume I.* (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. xvi, 488, 18 maps. \$6.50.)

ABOUT the ability and knowledge with which this book is written, there cannot be the slightest question. The field covers almost the whole surface of the earth, and describes in detail the simultaneous movements at high speed of ships and squadrons in the North Sea, the North and South Atlantic oceans, the Mediterranean, the North and South Pacific, the Indian Ocean, and the seas that skirt the eastern coast of Asia: and yet the pictures presented are consecutive and clear. The efforts of the author to produce a plain and interesting narrative are ably seconded by the publishers; for the make-up of the book is admirable in the highest degree, and presents a model that makes the work of most American publishers seem crude.

The narrative is arranged in chronological order, as far as possible, and naturally begins with the naval preparations, made before the war.

The author throughout evinces a high admiration for the work of the Admiralty, even before the war, and evidently seeks to impress his readers with the same feeling. In fact, in the opening sentence of his first chapter he says, "Amongst the many false impressions that prevailed, when after the lapse of a century we found ourselves involved in a great war, not the least erroneous is the belief that we were not prepared for it." Yet the statements that follow conclusively show that they were unprepared, though designed to show the contrary. That the author must have realized this himself is indicated by the following sentence on page 3, "It was not for want of study or foresight that we were found unprepared": and though the steps toward preparedness which the author details prove that there was no lack of study, they equally prove that there was a "plentiful lack" of foresight. They show that, although there were numerous committees at work (and at hard work), yet those committees looked ahead so little that, by the time any one of their tasks had been completed, the progress of invention and development had already made their decision inadequate. The committees seem to have been continuously behind the procession of events. In no case among the many mentioned does any committee or any decision seem to have endeavored to arrange to meet the conditions of even the approximate future. Among the many defects in foresight evidenced, the most remarkable are the failure to foresee the development of long-range firing, the submarine, and the aeroplane. The failure to realize the possibilities of the aeroplane must stand for many years to come as the most extraordinary single phenomenon in modern naval history.

A curious omission in detailing the steps of preparation is that of the names of Admiral Lord Fisher and Admiral Sir Percy Scott; for it was the work of these two men that varied the monotony of mere preparation in details (which engrossed the attention of the Admiralty) by supplying the invention needed for devising new and original plans. Sir Julian Corbett unconsciously shows that though much work was done by the Admiralty, it was done with a great lack of imagination and inventiveness. A possible reason is that navy officers, who had been trained in navy work, were put in subordinate positions in mapping out the important problems, and that the ultimate decisions were made by politicians.

That this was probably the case is shown by the difference in ability and results described, when the narrative leaves the Admiralty and goes on board the ships. Instead of dull and unimaginative routine, we see dash and brilliancy: instead of ineptness, we see skill of the highest order. Wherever we see the British navy officer doing what he has been trained to do, the narrative gives us pictures that glow and make our pulses throb. But in these same officers, put in the Admiralty and placed under politicians who control their appointments, and whose imaginations cannot possibly function correctly on naval possibilities for lack of knowledge (but who nevertheless have the *actual* power of decision), we see an almost incredible dullness.

Sir Julian does a great service to naval strategy by giving the weight of his authority to the doctrine that the primary function of the British fleet is to secure the command of home waters for the safety of British coasts and trade, and not merely to "seek out and destroy the enemy's main fleet". His narrative develops this doctrine quite naturally, and shows that fighting is objectless and resultless, unless it is done for a definite cause. Seen in this light, all the operations so brilliantly described in virtually all the waters of the globe appear, not like the meaningless shiftings of bits of colored glass in a kaleidoscope, but the harmonious and correlated movements of the parts of a gigantic organism. In this book literally, "all the world is a stage", and on this stage, a thrilling drama is enacted. The *dramatis personae* are not the little figures of men and women who slowly walk and turn, but ships and fleets filled with human beings trained to destructive tasks, that rush at enormous speed over enormous distances in calm and in storm, in cold and in heat, by night and by day, and decide by fighting of the most strenuous kind the destiny of the world.

In comparison with this book, any other book, even though it deal with mighty armies, seems modelled on microscopic lines. We thrill with the pictures of the fight near Heligoland in the North Sea, and see clearly the tragic fate of the *Cressy*, *Aboukir* and *Hogue*: then we watch the *Emden* on her daring raids over thousands of miles on the Pacific, until destroyed by the *Sydney* in the Cocos Islands. We watch the *Karlsruhe* on her equally dashing exploits in the North and South At-



lantic, till she suddenly vanishes from the surface of the sea after an unexplainable explosion within her. Then we note the gradual imprisoning of the *Königsberg*. Then we watch the unprecedented raids of Admiral von Spee, whose success ended with his victory over the too gallant Craddock in the ill-advised battle that Admiral Lord Fisher entered the Admiralty too late to prevent. Finally, we see the impulse of new life as Fisher re-enters the Admiralty, and the amazing trip on which he sends Admiral Sturdee in the *Invincible* and *Inflexible*, that culminated at the Falkland Islands in the sinking of von Spee's ships, the *Scharnhorst*, *Gneisenau*, *Nürnberg*, and *Leipzig*, and the escaping of the *Dresden*.

BRADLEY A. FISKE.

*Aus Meinem Leben.* Von Generalfeldmarschall VON HINDENBURG. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1920. Pp. xii, 409. \$3.75.)

HINDENBURG the man, Hindenburg the citizen, Hindenburg the soldier, appear and reappear with varying distinctness and impressiveness in these shifting scenes of an active and eventful life. It was a spring day in the year 1859 when the eleven-year-old youngster bade his father goodbye at the entrance to the Cadet School at Wahlstatt in Silesia, and brushing a tear from his new army coat, stepped alone through the iron gate into the fascinating and forbidding world of the profession of arms. Seven years of rather rough bodily training and systematic discipline, calculated to develop self-reliance and initiative as well as proper subordination, brought him to the first landmark in his career, his graduation on the eve of the war of 1866, and his appointment as a second lieutenant in the 3d Guard Infantry Regiment. As commander of a platoon, he did his part in the battle of Königgrätz, receiving a slight wound and his first decoration, the cross of the Red Eagle. A few years of garrison duty carried him to the opportunities and ordeals of the war of 1870.

With the pick of Prussia's military manhood, still armed with the comparatively short-range needle gun, he charged through the long-range fire of chassepots, across the slopes of St. Privat; stood in the iron ring that closed in on Napoleon III., and by his capture dealt the death-blow to his tottering empire, at Sedan; watched and waited in the throttling, battering girdle that brought Paris, and with it the Thiers republican régime, to submission.

Returning to Germany in 1871, he served with troops until 1873, when he entered the War Academy at Berlin as a student officer. In 1878, being about thirty-one years old, he was transferred as a captain from the line to the General Staff and assigned to the headquarters of the II. Army Corps. This was the beginning of his service as a general staff officer, which, with little interruption, was to continue through the rest of his career. From the headquarters of a corps he went, in

1881, to that of a division, and from there, in 1884, to a company as its commanding officer.

After a year of duty as company commander, he passed from the General Staff into the Great General Staff, and soon afterwards to the rank of major. He now collaborated in the preparation of the first Manual of Field Service Regulations, and in addition to this or other important work, discharged the duties of instructor of tactics at the War Academy. In 1889, he drew up instructions for engineer troops in the field and for the use of heavy field artillery in battle. From these desk duties he was glad to go, in 1893, to the command of an infantry regiment. From 1896 to 1900 he was chief of staff of the VIII. Army Corps, and on account of his long service in this position was excused from the usual tour of duty as brigade commander. From 1900 to 1903 he commanded the 28th Division, and from 1903 to 1911 the IV. Army Corps. With no war or advancement in sight, he applied in 1911 for retirement, and it was granted to him.

On August 22, 1914, Liège had fallen, and jubilations over German successes were spreading over Germany, but the Russians were penetrating East Prussia. Von Hindenburg was asked whether he was ready for immediate active service. He answered that he was, and consequently, at an age when an officer of the United States army is supposed to be fit only for sedentary duty, was placed in command of the VIII. Army, to which the Emperor and the country looked for deliverance and safety from the horrors of a Russian invasion. His career from now on is the story of the war on the eastern front, until August 29, 1916, when he became chief of staff of the army. After that it is the story of the war. It can be followed in the work of von Ludendorff, better than in the one before us. Von Ludendorff is fuller and more definite, and his maps are more numerous and helpful. Von Hindenburg, however, throws a new light on more than one interesting question. He lets us know (pp. 128, 129) that when, in the summer of 1915, von Ludendorff held to his plan of attack, in spite of the fact that von Falkenhayn, chief of staff of the army, had in the name of the Emperor prescribed a different one, von Hindenburg saw what his duty was in the matter; and he would have us believe that he did that duty. But on this point he fails to carry conviction. From the collective evidence of von Falkenhayn, von Ludendorff, and von Hindenburg, it appears that the plan prescribed by von Falkenhayn was not carried out, and that its failure was due to the withholding of forces for use in an attempt to execute the plan of von Ludendorff.

That von Hindenburg and von Ludendorff were later called to take the place of von Falkenhayn, goes to show how the German military machine had deteriorated since the days of old von Moltke and William I. In our comparatively rough-and-tumble struggle of "armed mobs", a Union general was court-martialled and disgraced on an ill-founded

charge of a less serious infraction of discipline than that of which von Ludendorff was primarily guilty, and for which von Hindenburg was principally responsible.

When von Falkenhayn was relieved, the reasons for such action, says von Hindenburg, were not communicated to him by the Emperor (p. 148). It may be inferred that they were made known to him by some one else. However this may be, neither von Hindenburg nor von Falkenhayn has given them to the public. But the attendant circumstances and the subsequent course of operations on the western front make it apparent that the principal reason for the change was the Emperor's disagreement with von Falkenhayn over the general policy for the conduct of the war. Von Falkenhayn was for defensive action with a view to wearing the enemy out. The Emperor still believed, it seems, in the possibility of breaking through the allied lines. He therefore wanted a vigorous, smashing offensive, such as von Hindenburg and von Ludendorff had stood for on the eastern front. One attempt after another to give him such a success ended in failure, and in July, 1918, it became necessary to renounce all further attempts; to abandon the territory that had been gained, and surrender the initiative to the enemy; in other words, to fall back on the methods advocated by von Falkenhayn.

In this last stage of the war von Ludendorff issued a proclamation in opposition to the peace terms proposed by President Wilson. He believed, it seems, that it expressed the ideas of the German government. This paper was submitted to von Hindenburg for signature and was signed by him, without being first signed, as was usual in such a case, by von Ludendorff. After von Ludendorff had signed and issued it, he (von Ludendorff) learned that it did not agree with the views of the government. He promptly withdrew it, but it was too late. The mischief had been done.

Von Hindenburg makes no allusion to this document, but gives the text of a communication which he addressed on the same day, October 24, 1918, to the German Chancellor, calling for all possible reinforcement and moral support of the army (p. 396); in other words, for a *levée en masse*. It is only fair to assume that he had signed the von Ludendorff proclamation without knowing what he was doing. At any rate von Ludendorff, and not he, was held responsible for it. On October 26, the Emperor accepted the resignation of von Ludendorff and declined to accept that of von Hindenburg.

JOHN BIGELOW.

*Deutschland und Amerika: Erinnerungen aus dem Fünfjährigen Kriege.* Von Graf JOHANN HEINRICH BERNSTORFF. (Berlin: Ullstein und Co. 1920. Pp. xii, 414.)

*My Three Years in America.* By Count BERNSTORFF. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. 428. \$5.00.)

THE primary purpose of Count von Bernstorff in writing these memoirs is to deny the misstatements, and to refute the charges, concerning his diplomacy made in the writings of his critics and opponents, also those made before the committee of the United States Senate which investigated German propaganda, and before the committee of the German National Assembly which investigated the conduct of the war. That he is largely successful in accomplishing his purpose, save in one important respect noted below, is beyond question.

A comprehensive review of the relations between the United States and Germany before the war serves as a natural introduction to the principal theme. It is in the main a fair and unbiased presentation of the facts, interspersed with sound observations on the character of the American people. The author errs, however, in placing too high an estimate on English influence in shaping American opinion on many matters, cultural, political, and international.

German propaganda in the United States receives a thorough and critical discussion. The fundamental cause of its failure is attributed to a misunderstanding by the Germans of American national psychology. The outstanding trait of Americans is not, in the author's opinion, a cool and calculating business quality, but a great, though superficial, sentimentality. Germany made the mistake of trying to give the Americans the truth about the war, for which they cared nothing, instead of stirring their feelings with tales of suffering inflicted on Germany by the British blockade.

A lengthy endeavor is made under the caption, the So-called German Conspiracies, to convey the impression that no one connected with the German embassy was responsible for the many criminal acts committed here in the interest of Germany. Concerning himself Count von Bernstorff makes the following denial:

I have never taken part in any acts which were in conflict with the laws of the United States. I have neither instigated such acts, nor knowingly aided in their commission by supplies of money or in any other way. I have not in a single instance had previous knowledge of a really criminal act or of the preparations for such an act. I regularly learned of them first through the newspapers (p. 107).

Yet Albert Kaltschmidt, who was convicted on every criminal charge in an indictment of five counts, was paid \$25,000 by a New York bank from a joint account in the name of Heinrich F. Albert and J. Bernstorff. Other evidence, which cannot be adduced here because of limited space, indicates that the ambassador's denial is substantially false. With regard to Captain von Papen and Boy-Ed, both attached to the German embassy, the author conveys the wholly false impression that they had no share in any criminal acts, and pictures them, when recalled, as sacrificed to a defamatory and mendacious press.

In his chapter on the sinking of the *Lusitania* the author takes up

questions of international law and of German policy and these he treats at all times in a masterly manner. He states with cogency and force the case against the United States for submitting to a violation of its rights by England, while resisting the encroachments of Germany, but admits that had Germany not brought on herself the odium of invading Belgium and sinking freight and passenger ships, the course of the United States and of other neutrals probably would have been different, and to Germany's advantage.

In connection with his account of the *Arabic* incident he makes other frank criticisms of German policy, as in his note (August 24, 1916) to Berlin in which he points out that the German government in its submarine warfare committed the error of choosing a middle course, which lessened the effectiveness of the submarine, but did not avert the war with America.

The note from the German government (April 10, 1916) concerning the *Sussex*, which was torpedoed in the English Channel, is called the most unfortunate official document which ever went from Berlin to Washington. President Wilson believed it untruthful and his reply was given the form of an ultimatum concerning which Count von Bernstorff says:

It is my firm conviction that diplomatic relations would not have been broken in 1917 were it not for this ultimatum. In the increased tension of the situation caused by the exchange of notes over the *Sussex* I see one of the most vital causes of the war with America (p. 245).

American Mediation is the title for the longest and most important chapter in the book. It presents a large number of telegrams and reports to and from Berlin which are invaluable in forming an estimate of official German opinion late in 1916, a few weeks before the United States declared war. That Bethmann-Hollweg and other responsible German statesmen were striving for peace and made its attainment a fundamental aim of their policy is evident from these documents. The German Chancellor (September, 1916) urges Count von Bernstorff to hasten President Wilson's proposal for peace; a little later he advises the ambassador to persuade the President to act with the Pope, the King of Spain, and other neutrals in ending the war, predicting that such action could not be repelled by the Entente and would gain for the President a certain re-election and a renowned place in history.

For the historian and student of the war Count von Bernstorff's book has undoubted value. It contains many searching criticisms of Germany's policies, political and military, and many well-considered interpretations of events, founded on a thorough knowledge of international law and relations. It tells much concerning public opinion in the United States, reveals some phases of American diplomacy not appreciated by the American public, and narrates many instructive incidents. Its special and distinctive value is that it gives a lucid, comprehensive, and

detailed account of the relations between Germany and the United States, with a large number of illustrative documents; treats with a fullness of detail not found elsewhere President Wilson's attempt to mediate between the warring powers of Europe, and offers a weighty and convincing defense, fraught with logic and good sense, of the author's diplomacy while ambassador to the United States.

Since the above review was written, a translation of Count von Bernstorff's book has appeared (Charles Scribner's Sons). It is an excellent piece of work, exact and accurate, but not too literal. In spite of some rather clumsy sentences, it can be read with pleasure, because written in pure English, instead of the mongrel language of many translations, with the vocabulary English and the idioms German.

The excellence of the translation may be due in part to the style of Count von Bernstorff; for, unlike many German writers, he does not hide his thought behind dense and complicated entanglements of language, but sets it forth in clear, short, crisp sentences.

E. E. SPERRY.

*The Inside Story of the Peace Conference.* By Dr. E. J. DILLON.  
(New York and London: Harper and Brothers. Pp. xi, 513.  
\$2.50.)

THE title of this book is singularly non-descriptive. It has none of the qualities of narrative and every page betrays the fact that the author remained entirely outside the real workings of the Conference. It is in form a series of loose-jointed articles dealing ostensibly with such subjects as the City of the Conference, censorship, the personalities, aims, and methods of the peacemakers, Italian policy, Bolshevism, and the League Covenant. In reality it is little but the rather peevish reflections of a veteran correspondent who, snubbed by the Big Four, found solace in railing at their work in the company of Bratiano and the delegates of the smaller states. His chief complaint is that the Conference was dominated by the ignorant Anglo-Saxon "Duumvirs", Wilson and Lloyd George. The former, he believes, might have aroused the masses of Europe to support of his policy—a policy which Mr. Dillon, in his heart, evidently despises, for in his description of the Rumanian violation of the armistice he is obviously glad "to see the haze of self-righteousness and cant at last dispelled by a whiff of wholesome egotism". But Wilson lacked the courage and his interference ultimately served merely to confuse the settlement, which, the author insists, is based neither upon justice nor upon expediency. The French he attacks without discrimination, whether they oppose or yield to Wilson.

Such an attitude, involving wholesale condemnation of the Conference, is comprehensible, but the author's substantiation of his assertions is so prolix, confused, and apparently dependent upon the merest gossip, that it will hardly carry conviction with the critical reader. He is in-

consistent in his generalizations as to his particulars. Thus on page 274, "Sentiment in politics is a myth"; but on page 284, speaking of Italian policy, "Where sentiment actuates, reason is generally unimportant". He pictures Wilson again and again as the irresponsible master of the Conference, sharing power only with Lloyd George, and as often he emphasizes the defeats which the President underwent at the hands of Clemenceau. On page 185 he complains that Wilson refused to grant the Rhine frontier to France; but on page 188 we find, "whenever Britain or France's interests seemed to be imperiled by the putting in force of any of the Fourteen Points, Mr. Wilson desisted from its application". The author, who obviously never entered the room, pictures the Council of Ten in wholly imaginary fashion sitting around a table with Clemenceau at the head. He lays bitter stress upon the allegation that apart from Mantoux's notes there is no record of what was done by the Council of Four, evidently ignorant of the careful mimeographed reports. He takes as text for an onslaught on the tactics of the chief statesmen an apocryphal rebuke administered by Clemenceau to Bratiano (p. 236), the falsity of which the reviewer can attest. And if Mr. Dillon insists on substituting gossip for fact, it is a pity to take the point out of Clemenceau's witty epigram on Klotz (p. 423), which may or may not be authentic. Constant use of the *Chicago Tribune*, the Paris edition of the *Herald*, and the *Echo de Paris*, explains, perhaps, misstatements too numerous to list. It is not true that the Polish Commission was dismissed unheard (p. 105); nor that the leading statesmen were opposed to a plebiscite in Teschen (p. 191); nor that two American censors concealed from Europe the opposition to Wilson in the United States (p. 119); nor that when "Italy invoked self-determination she was promptly non-suited" (p. 313); nor was it in March, 1919, that "Wilson hit upon the expedient of linking the Covenant with the Peace Treaty" (p. 141). With all respect to Mr. Dillon's experience, he has written a misleading book.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*Africa and the Discovery of America.* By LEO WIENER, Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures in Harvard University. Volume I. (Philadelphia: Innes and Sons. 1920. Pp. xix, 290. \$5.00.)

PROFESSOR WIENER makes in this work another contribution to the rising tide of books relating to the earliest history of the New World. He approaches his subject along the less popular and, it must be affirmed, less certain path, that of philology.

The reviewer has always been suspicious of the "last word" treatise, and he was not a little shocked to find that Professor Wiener's studies



led him to conclude "that American Archaeology was to a great extent built on sand".

He tells us that he has undertaken to show in this his first volume—a second will relate to African fetichism—that the negroes, that is the Africans, have had a far greater influence upon the civilization of America, beginning with the discovery of Columbus, than has ever been suspected, and he proceeds to demonstrate this in a somewhat disconnected treatment, primarily from a philological standpoint.

It is unfortunate that one so well trained in this field of study should not have undertaken to present his material in a more logical and readable manner. He is not always convincing, and is often dogmatic.

The reviewer regrets that his space does not permit numerous citations. Let us note first, as an example of the author's treatment, the word "Lucayos", not one which originated with Columbus though it appears in his Journal entry of October 11. "The word does not occur again in any of the writings of the first voyagers to America." It however does appear on the early maps as "Jucayos" and "Yucayos", but of this the author appears to be ignorant. It is hardly convincing to derive "Lucaies" from the semiuncial writing of the word "Indies" as it appears on the Catalan map of 1375, which is cited as directly or indirectly influencing Columbus, though we may write or print the word in "Gothic type". The same point may be made as to the derivation of the word "Guanahani" or "Gwanahim" from "Giaua min." (Java Minor) as on the Fra Mauro map.

If there is any substantial reason for affirming that Columbus had with him other than a sailor's chart, a portolan chart on which islands to the westward were laid down, it has yet to be advanced. Why imagine that Columbus had the Catalan, the Fra Mauro, or the Albertin de Virga, or a derivative of either? Such maps were not then copied and passed around, so far as we have any knowledge.

Many of the author's analyses of words but remotely suggest that his theme is "Africa and the Discovery of America". In his treatment of his subject he has drawn for his first chapter from the Journal of the First Voyage and the First Letter of Columbus; in his second chapter from the accounts of the Second Voyage; in his third chapter we are introduced to a consideration of the original home of Tobacco, and this he traces to Africa, finding philological and archaeological support for his theories, while his fourth and concluding chapter deals with the origin of the several bread roots, including sweet potatoes, yams, etc.

The work contains an extensive list of sources quoted, and no fewer than twenty well-selected illustrations largely archaeological in character.

E. L. STEVENSON.

*Louisbourg from its Foundation to its Fall, 1713-1758.* By J. S. McLENNAN. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1918. Pp. xi, 454.)

THIS weighty volume was printed in the spring of 1914, but the Great War held up publication until late in 1918. It will not interest a lazy reader. It is the kind of book that will be most acceptable to the historical scholar, to whom it will be not only an interpretation but also a source-book for the forty-five years of history of the seat of French power on the North Atlantic coast of America. The author states that his "work is intended to present in detail the economic and administrative history of the colony, as well as to bring that history into harmony with the wider outlook on the events of the time". He has studied an immense mass of documents in French and English documentary repositories, as well as those at Ottawa, Boston, and other places in America. He has verified the documents, or citations from them, which other authors have used, and when he himself cites the works of modern authors he does so by endorsement and because he believes their books, being so far trustworthy, are more accessible than the original sources. His own volume is replete, however, with the texts of most important documents and contains as well reproductions of numerous old views and prints. Specially important are maps and plans never before reproduced, such as large maps relating to the sieges of 1745 and 1758, taken from originals in the Section Hydrographique, Marine, at Paris, and a pleasing colored folded view of Louisbourg in 1731, from the original manuscript in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. Some of the chapters of the book have documentary appendixes, but particularly pages 315-439 consist of fourteen appendixes of documents, rosters, ships' lists, population tables, trade and economic data, and numismata. An index fills pages 441-454, but is unsatisfactory. Unfortunately there is no table of contents.

McLennan says with respect to his work: "Some of the views presented differ from those usually taken of this period and the events herein dealt with." The relative success of the French fisheries, as compared with those of New England; the lack of efficiency and armament in British outposts, and the slackness of some of their officers; the origins of the expedition of 1745 and the importance of Pepperrell in securing its adoption by the legislature of Massachusetts, are instances in which the views presented "differ" from those he held when he began his study of the original documents.

The first chapter recounts the manner in which Cape Breton Island was first settled; an appendix to it is a good anonymous French memoir of 1706, on the advantages of commerce and the fishery. The second chapter tells about the conflicting ideas regnant as to preferential settlements, the proposed removal of Acadians to Cape Breton, and the

decline of Louisbourg under maladministration in 1715. The third chapter shows the direction of affairs in 1716 by the Navy Board, in the Regency that followed the death of Louis XIV. The object of this administration "was to establish at Isle Royale a flourishing settlement based on its principal industry, the fisheries, and the development of the other resources of the Island, and an *entrepôt* at which the commerce based on these industries might be carried on with France, the West Indies, and Canada". In 1717-1718 conditions were desperate and food was almost gone. Drink was "the chief drawback to the prosperity of Louisbourg". Efforts to curb the evil made little impression. In 1719 Louisbourg was chosen as the capital. Chapter IV. is devoted to the disputes between the English and French over the Canceau (Canso) fisheries, and an Indian attack there in August, 1720. Chapter V. deals with the economic status, illicit trade (1720-1728), smallpox epidemic, and famine (1723-1733 and 1737). In 1738, the codfishing industry had a value of three million livres. Chapter VI. describes in detail the finished fortification of Louisbourg, the conditions of population, and the variability of the climate. Between 1739 and 1743 food had again become scarce and the fisheries were a failure (chap. VII.). The outbreak of war in 1744 and the operations against Canso and Louisbourg, together with the state of the military resources of the latter, Pepperrell's influence and Shirley's activity in setting up the expedition of 1745, and a detailed account of the siege and capture of the town, are given in chapters VIII.-X. Notice should be taken of the documents relating to the capture of the *Vigilant*, etc., in the appendix to chapter X., as well as naval documents attached to chapter XI. The fisheries and commerce during Druccour's administration are recited in chapter XII.; the second English siege and capture in 1758, and Boscawen's relation thereto, with naval documents in appendixes, make up chapters XIII. and XIV. The demolition of the fortress and defenses was proposed by Pitt, February 9, 1760. The last chapter (XV.) is an analysis of the causes of the failure of French colonial administration and of the importance of sea-power in colonization.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

*The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies.* By CHARLES HARTSHORN MAXSON, Assistant Professor of Political Science in the University of Pennsylvania. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1920. Pp. vii, 158. \$1.25.)

To the work done long ago for New England by Tracy's *Great Awakening* Professor Charles Hartshorn Maxson adds a study of the awakening of religious passion in the Middle Colonies, using not only the materials found in books and pamphlets, but also newspapers and manuscript sermons and records. The situation with which he deals

differed markedly from the homogeneity of race and ecclesiasticism found in New England. He has to study movements among elements of diverse tongue, Dutch Reformed, Irish Presbyterian, groups transplanted from New England, and Germans who were divided as Lutheran, Reformed, Mennonite, Dunkers, Moravian. His effort is to show that, apart from the rather late extension of the Edwards revival to Long Island and northern New Jersey, there were three contributory sources for the movement, all earlier than the New England revival. German, Dutch, and Scotch-Irish revival beginnings, independent in origin but affecting one another, made the country "ready to be swept by a wave of emotionalism, if only a leader could be found who was broad in sympathy, deep in emotional experience, and commissioned by a prophet's gift of utterance. This leader was found in George Whitefield." Mr. Maxson then proceeds to show the fusion of the various currents into an interconfessional movement under Whitefield's dominating influence, the triumph of evangelicalism in spite of various schisms, the work of Whitefield as a great Pacificator, and the transformation of the religious energies thus liberated into forces social, humanitarian, educational, and political.

Not all of these intentions are satisfactorily developed. We have abundant grounds for recognizing in the fervent missionary spirit of "evangelical" religion a source of humanitarian enterprises—German, English, and Scottish history demonstrate this—but Mr. Maxson has a meagre showing of results in America. We should like also to see the evidence that Princeton, Dartmouth, Brown, Rutgers, and the University of Pennsylvania were "direct fruits of the revival". It is maintained, not demonstrated, and when the Shepherd's Tent at New London is counted as proof of the revivalists' zeal for education our confidence is weakened. It was missing a good chance, also, not to do something more like demonstration with the interesting view that the Awakening prepared the way for the Revolutionary War by establishing community of feeling among Calvinist churches and uniting them against the English Church, creating a spiritual union prophetic of political union.

The leading value of the work is in its account of the initial influence of Frelinghuysen and the Tennents and the unifying rôle taken by Whitefield, and we can only regret that the initiators have not been explained. What we call the Great Awakening was American participation in an international and interdenominational movement, and it is of interest to discover the channels by which this energizing of religious sensibility spread from land to land. Frelinghuysen brought the enthusiasm from Holland, but Mr. Maxson does not particularize as to influences quickening him in formative years. The older Tennent had been a priest of the church in Ireland; what shaped him to his new career? The spiritual impetus was brought to the Middle Colonies from Europe

and Mr. Maxson surmises that a knowledge of German Pietism such as Cotton Mather shows may have contributed to the revival efforts of Edwards in 1734. This surmise is precarious in view of Edwards's silence on the point in the letters to Erskine where he shows himself aware of the international aspect of the Awakening, but it is probable enough that there were preparations for the seemingly sudden social change to powerful emotional experiences. Like most of his predecessors, Mr. Maxson exaggerates the emotional apathy and routine observances of the churches before the revival excitement. New England, however, was reading and republishing Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* and when Mr. Maxson characterizes the new evangelical piety of the Awakening as "the life of God in the soul of man", we remind ourselves that the work of Henry Scougal, from whom the phrase comes, was republished in Philadelphia in 1725 and again in 1730. Scougal's conception of religion was, to be sure, remote both from the revivalist conversion type and a passionless doctrinal orthodoxy, but the interest in it may imply that preparations for a time of vivid personal experience were not limited in the Middle Colonies to the preaching of Frelinghuysen and the Tennents.

The interesting chapter on Whitefield the Pacificator emphasizes amiable and generous traits of the great preacher and his willingness to correct his own errors. Enthusiasm for this hero, however, makes Mr. Maxson a partizan in the conflicts of the time. It is not a discriminating historian who speaks of Whitefield's critics as gnashing their teeth at him or pronounces Whitefield's attack on the tutor of Harvard College a censure well deserved. He reduces to passing mention certain hysterical and pathological phenomena. He speaks of "the excesses of a few under the frenzied leadership of Davenport", but in other references takes Davenport under his protection. Judging by his account we are to believe that revival methods in the Middle Colonies were relatively free from the extravagances which discredited and checked the movement in New England.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*History of Journalism in the United States.* By GEORGE HENRY PAYNE. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1920. Pp. xx, 453. \$2.50.)

WHEN colleges and Chautauquas established educational gateways into the profession of journalism, they created a demand for instruction in the history of that profession. Obviously the preparation of a course of lectures on such a subject inevitably suggests the publication of a book. Such was the genesis of Professor J. M. Lee's volume on the *History of American Journalism*, which was published in 1917. Mr. Payne's book springs from a similar origin, since the author recently lectured upon this topic at Cooper Union.

In narration, this book compares favorably with its predecessors. The story is compact, but it moves to a lively tune, and is widely allusive. The personal human interest is widely kept in the foreground, and Mr. Payne reveals a keen perception of the dramatic values of his subject.

The index is satisfactory. There is a good bibliography, for which the author acknowledges his indebtedness to Mr. James W. Davis. It covers twenty-nine pages. It is gratifying to find the local histories of nineteen states listed, and surprising that others are not mentioned at all. Among recent important books one must note the omission of John L. Heaton's *Story of a Page; Thirty Years of Public Service and Public Discussion in the Editorial Columns of the "New York World"* (Harper, 1913). Henry Watterson's reminiscences are also overlooked, though Mr. Payne quotes "Marse Henry" in the text.

There are nine appendixes, the most interesting of which are William Cullen Bryant's Index Expurgatorius of words, and Horace Greeley's letter declaring his political independence of Seward and Weed.

It is at times uncertain whether Mr. Payne is writing a history of journalism or of democracy. He visualizes the two as the legs on which civilization marches forward, and his story relates to political journalism only. Of journalism as a business, of commercial and industrial journalism, of religious and scientific journalism, this book shows no trace of remembrance. The figures which Mr. Payne projects upon the screen, as the dominant men of the profession, are crusading political and professional reformers and partizan editorial writers. He goes so far as to say that the greatness of journalism is due to the spirit of such men as Lundy, Birney, Lovejoy, and Garrison. Perhaps it is still open to debate whether journalism should be primarily concerned with the discovery and dissemination of news, or with the advocacy of beliefs.

This book would be described with more precision if it were entitled "Relations between Journalism and Politics in the United States from Colonial Times to the End of the Civil War Period".

In a sufficiently leisurely manner Mr. Payne surveys the beginnings of journalism in the colonies, and thereafter keeps rather closely to the well-beaten path that leads around Newspaper Row in New York City. This course is commendable if one is to write some interesting lectures, introducing to the study of journalism as a profession, but it is not likely to produce an adequate history of that profession, dealing justly with all sections of our country.

Here are 382 pages of text, and virtually one-half of them are devoted to journalism prior to 1800. The next sixty-five years claim 135 pages, and the story is well told, with the spot-light lingering on Cincinnati, Washington, and New York, chiefly on the last named. This arrangement of space leaves only fifty-eight pages for the period from

1865 to 1920, the period of Dana, Nelson, Watterson, and Ochs, of Pixley, Otis, Grady, Pulitzer, and Hearst, the period of the extraordinary development of Melville E. Stone's great news-gathering association, and of its rival, the United Press. Should not this emphasis be exactly reversed? Colonial journalism might be estimated in fifty-eight pages. After all, the Zenger trial looms larger in the history of law than in that of journalism. Two hundred pages would be none too many for the survey of the growth of journalism during the last fifty years.

In passing, it may be worth while to question whether Franklin's literary debt to Addison was important enough to justify a triple repetition of it (pp. 31, 32, 44). Among the typical journalists of our day, above-mentioned, Mr. Payne ignores Pixley, Otis, and Ochs. So far as this book is concerned, the latest event in the history of journalism on the Pacific coast is the murder of James King of William in 1855. Mr. Payne is aware that Hearst (upon whom his glance falls kindly) came from California, but Brisbane is barely mentioned, and Grady is equally evanescent, in a foot-note. Col. M. H. DeYoung, of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, will scarcely believe that a book on the history of journalism could be written without alluding to him, but Mr. Payne has done it. John W. Forney's name is twice mentioned as important, but no one can find in this book the reason why.

The question of the ownership of newspapers, either in the form of a chain of them possessed by one man (Hearst is not the only multiple journalist), or as a part of the battery of some syndicate, is not touched by Mr. Payne, nor does he consider the problem of advertisements. He makes no reference to Mr. Stone and the Associated Press, nor to the United Press. Recently, a well-known Socialist has published a furious indictment of the Associated Press and of leading newspapers in various sections of our country on the ground of alleged injustice, suppression of facts, and downright falsehood. No one would learn from Mr. Payne's book that there is a Socialist press, or a Labor press, or that anyone harbors serious grievances against the institution of journalism as now established and conducted.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

*John Marshall and the Constitution: a Chronicle of the Supreme Court.* By EDWARD S. CORWIN. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XVI.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. ix, 242.)

*The Fight for a Free Sea: a Chronicle of the War of 1812.* By RALPH D. PAYNE. [*Id.*, vol. XVII.] (*Ibid.* 1920. Pp. xi, 235.)



*Pioneers of the Old Southwest: a Chronicle of the Dark and Bloody Ground.* By CONSTANCE LINDSAY SKINNER. [*Id.*, vol. XVIII.] (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. xi, 304.)

*The Old Northwest: a Chronicle of the Ohio Valley and Beyond.* By FREDERIC AUSTIN OGG. [*Id.*, vol. XIX.] (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. x, 220.)

*The Reign of Andrew Jackson: a Chronicle of the Frontier in Politics.* By FREDERIC AUSTIN OGG. [*Id.*, vol. XX.] (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. x, 249.)

THE volumes in the *Chronicles of America* are attractive, though that is not their only claim to consideration. Those before me are a joy to look upon and a joy to handle. They are as a rule unusually well written. If history must be made pleasing, these volumes satisfy. It seems also that the abundance and appropriateness of the illustrations form almost a contribution. There is here a collection of well-selected engravings, of portraits, paintings, and drawings running through the fields of American history which general reader and scholar alike can appreciate.

The writer thinks also that the editors deserve commendation for their skillful division of the field of American history. They have shown cleverness and originality in the selection of topics for volumes, and have afforded opportunities for discussions not readily found elsewhere.

The volumes before the reviewer were all worth writing. The best from the point of view of critical scholarship is the first, Professor Corwin's *John Marshall and the Constitution*. The editors are not always as fortunate in the selection of authors as in the case of Professor Corwin. His studies in constitutional interpretation, long continued, enable him to speak with authority when he unfolds and analyzes the constitutional opinions of the great jurist who here furnishes his theme. Although Corwin has made large use of the monumental work of Beveridge in his hunt for facts, his scholarly training enables him to be more penetrating than the distinguished biographer, more incisive, and more authoritative as a critic.

Birth in the up-country would not account for Marshall's nationalistic views. Jefferson and Calhoun were both up-country men. The reading of Pope's *Essay on Man* may have had effect, and the joint acquaintance of Thomas Marshall and his son John with General Washington no doubt operated powerfully on the mind of the young soldier and lawyer. Professor Corwin is willing to admit that Marshall's investment in the Fairfax estate, "though it did not impart to his political and constitutional views their original bent, yet must have operated more or less to confirm his opinions" (p. 44) and "to keep alert his natural sympathy for all victims of legislative oppression" (p. 45).

Though an admirer and eulogist, in the way of biographers of John Marshall, Corwin nevertheless can give due honor to his great antagonist (see p. 55).

The author evidently thinks that the power of the court to overthrow legislative enactments on the ground of unconstitutionality was both intentionally conferred by the Fathers and deducible by inevitable logic from their language. His discussion of this theme, however, lacks the sweep and strength of McLaughlin's treatment in *The Courts, the Constitution, and Parties*. It is keen, however, and scholarly. It would seem that it would be worth while mentioning that Marshall's great teacher, George Wythe, was a staunch upholder of the doctrine of judicial supremacy, in *Commonwealth v. Caton* putting it forward with impressive language. Corwin's discussion of Marshall's method in *Marbury v. Madison* shows how the Chief Justice, by taking various questionable and untenable attitudes, found a way to lecture the President (Jefferson) and to establish this doctrine of judicial supremacy over the acts of legislative bodies. Indeed, Corwin presents Marshall's opinion (not by way of censure) as "a political coup of the first magnitude" (p. 66).

As a matter of fact Marshall refused to regard his office merely as a judicial tribunal: "it was a platform from which to promulgate sound constitutional principles". Marshall could have decided all of his great cases on comparatively narrow grounds but he believed in this mission and was a great debater. His weapon was the "*obiter dictum*—by whose broad strokes was hewn the highroad of a national destiny" (p. 123). The most brilliant passage in the book is that in which the author presents this view of Marshall's "profound conviction of calling" and the course and methods which it led him to pursue.

Professor Corwin's book is deserving of a more complete analysis than the limitations of space make possible here. Holding that Marshall's reading of the Constitution "may be summarized in a phrase; it transfixed State Sovereignty with a two-edged sword, one edge of which was inscribed 'National Supremacy' and the other 'Private Rights'" (p. 173), Professor Corwin describes and examines the famous cases and decisions. Criticizing the behavior and riddling the opinions of the Chief Justice in the Burr trial, Corwin says, "Marshall's conduct of Burr's trial for treason is the one serious blemish in his judicial record" (p. 111). *Gibbons v. Ogden* "is his profoundest, most statesmanlike opinion" (p. 137). Professor Corwin is very free and sharp in his criticism, but usually finds a way of claiming that the decision was not so bad after all, and is unshaken in his conviction of the magnificence of the service, abilities, and character of the famous jurist. And most will agree with him that "there is no fame among American statesmen more strongly bulwarked by great and still vital institutions" (p. 230), and

that "his judicial statesmanship finds no parallel in the salient features of its achievement outside our own annals" (p. 231).

Ralph D. Paine's essay on *The Fight for a Free Sea* is an account of the War of 1812. The title indicates Mr. Paine's interpretation of the second war with England. "'Free Trade and Sailors' Rights!" was the American war cry. It expressed the two grievances which outweighed all others—the interference with American shipping and the ruthless impressment of seamen from beneath the Stars and Stripes" (p. 3). On this, the orthodox theory, no wonder Mr. Paine has difficulty in making clear why we should have declared war on England alone, when the offences of France against American commerce were equally high-handed (p. 3) and finds it strange "that those States which had seen their sailors impressed by thousands and which had suffered most heavily from England's attacks on neutral commerce should have arrayed themselves in bitter opposition to the cause and the Government" (p. 8). As a matter of fact the less interest statesmen and citizens had in the "Fight for a Free Sea", the more eager they were for war. Back-countrymen and westerners, Indian-fighters, fur-traders, landhunters, expansionists, who believed that the territory from the Gulf to the "regions of eternal frost" should belong to the Americans—these were the men who took things into their own hands, for reasons of their own, and declared the war against Great Britain. However, it is Mr. Paine's function not to expound the causes of the War of 1812 but to tell the story, and this he does right well, particularly when he gets away from the fight these westerners were making for Canada, and comes into the field of his own enthusiasm, the story of the cleverness, skill, heroism, and service of American seamen. What the privateers did he has discussed in another volume of this series, *The Old Merchant Marine*. Mr. Paine narrates with conviction and interest the story of what a navy which had been "neglected and almost despised" was able to do to redeem American honor.

Writing in the midst of the Great War, the author could not avoid pointing out to us how "sons of the Canadian militia and the red-coated regulars of the British line, sons of the tarry seamen of the *Constitution* and the *Guerrière* stood side by side as brothers in arms to save from brutal obliteration the same spirit of freedom", nor to keep his pen from contrasting whenever possible the spirit of humanity and the generosity shown vanquished seamen on both sides in the sea battles of 1812 with the inhumanity and barbarity exemplified by the submarine commanders acting under the naval code of Germany.

In *Pioneers of the Old Southwest*, Miss Skinner writes in a fascinating way about the settlement of the "Back Country" of Virginia and North Carolina, and the founding of Kentucky and Tennessee. She is a good illustration, as to a certain extent Mr. Paine is, of a type of writer whom the editors of this series have selected. Miss Skinner is a

newspaper and magazine writer, dramatic and musical critic, and playwright, not particularly associated with the development of historical scholarship. However, assigned a topic which appealed to the story-writer's and dramatist's instinct, she has succeeded much better than would have been expected or than this reviewer thought she had done in the first examination of her volume. It is true that at times she has allowed the imagination rather free rein and has overdone "we think", "prefer to picture her", "what does she see when she looks at him?" and the like. The rhetoric may be occasionally a bit exuberant, but none can deny that she has presented a reasonably truthful and worthy story of the eventful days and stalwart people whom she describes. She has made good use of "the writings and journals of pioneers and contemporary observers", quoting from them with effect. The Scotch-Irish, with their "passion for a whole freedom", keeping the Sabbath "and everything else they could lay their hands on", pushing on through Pennsylvania, through the Shenandoah valley of Virginia, on to the Yadkin of North Carolina, met others who entered through Charleston, also bold and hungry after land. They made a religion of everything they undertook, and regarded civil rights as divine rights. It does not seem, however, that Miss Skinner ought even to be tempted to claim on the basis of the "Mecklenburg Declaration" that they were the first to declare for American independence (p. 7). The Scottish Highlanders, somewhat overlooked in American history, and the Germans, the Pennsylvania Dutch, the "second largest racial stream which flowed into the Back Country of Virginia and North Carolina", are also given their full place. These various racial elements, Scotch-Irish, Highland Scots, Germans, founded in the up-country a civilization very different from the somewhat aristocratic life of the tide-water, a difference due not alone to difference in racial origin, for men of English origin also poured into this region, but due also to the fight with the Indian, the wild animals, the obstacles of nature. The author, though general, is successful in the chapter portraying the "Folk-ways" of these people (chap. II.). She is more particular in her discussion (chap. III.) of "the Trader", "America's first magnate of international commerce", the pathfinder and forerunner.

Other chapters tell the relation of the Back Country to the French and Indian War, narrate the adventurous story of Daniel Boone, the wanderer, describe the history of the Transylvania Company, the ambitions and errors of Judge Richard Henderson. The early history of Tennessee is revealed in the careers of two friends, James Robertson and John Sevier. The climax of the story is reached in the account of King's Mountain. "King's Mountain was the prelude to Cornwallis's defeat." It "broke the Tory spirit". "It was the pivot of the war's revolving stage which swung the British from their succession of victories towards the surrender at Yorktown" (pp. 221-222).

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—8

The *Old Northwest*, by Frederick Austin Ogg, tells again and well the story of the territory north and west of the Ohio River from 1763 to the territorial organization of Minnesota in 1849. Mr. Ogg tells it in a moving way, with more than the usual emphasis on the "life and spirit of the people." It is the story of English efforts to handle the problem of Indian relations and the organization of the Western region; of Indian wars and Indian struggles to retain the lands which were bandied about from nation to nation and occupied by white men with slight regard to the red men's rights or ambitions; of the American Revolution as it affected the region south of the Great Lakes; of the War of 1812 and the activities of western militiamen; of the westward tide of immigration, the building and organization of territories and commonwealths.

The Indians did not welcome the transfer of the Western country from France to England, hence Pontiac's conspiracy. Even Benjamin Franklin, although, unlike many, he conjured up "a splendid vision of the western valleys teeming with a thriving population", thought this dream would not be realized for "some centuries" (p. 22). The proclamation of 1763, in restricting settlement of the Western region, angered those who did not defy it; the Quebec Act, by incorporating the region running south to the Ohio into the province of Quebec, in which French institutions were properly allowed to prevail, became a revolutionary grievance.

George Rogers Clark with surprising vision and undaunted courage wrested the northwest region from English military control in 1778 and 1779, and John Jay, with similar vision and courage in the statesman's field, broke instructions to make sure that Spain and France did not in the treaty of peace have this land turned into an Indian territory. The statesmanship of the American Revolution was at its best in laying plans for the development of the Western lands. The states surrendered them, the Congress pledged their disposal for the common benefit and their creation into republican states, and in the ordinance of 1787 laid down admirably fundamental principles and plans of government. Mr. Ogg strangely does not mention the significant ordinance of 1785 with its land system and provision for education. The defeat of Tecumseh and the War of 1812 removed both the "British menace and the danger from the Indians" (p. 160). Meanwhile settlers had been pouring into this land of opportunity. Men of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, into Southern Illinois and Indiana; men from New England, New York and Pennsylvania, into the region north of the latitude of Indianapolis. These settlers of different sectional and racial origins agreed on internal improvements, the tariff, opposition to the National Bank; they differed on the form of local government and negro slavery. In consequence of this juxtaposition of men of diverse sectional origins, "throughout the great era of slavery controversy the Northwest was prolific of schemes of compromise" (p. 183).

The next volume, also by Mr. Ogg, likewise has its beginning with the peace of 1763. For shortly after that event came to this country one Andrew Jackson, Scottish Presbyterian, and father of the President. Mr. Ogg thinks the preponderance of evidence points to the birth of Andrew Jackson in South Carolina.

The victim of British cruelty and of the misfortunes of war, he "always hated the British uniform" and later as President "an anti-British feeling colored all of his dealings with foreign nations" (p. 9). One more argument for the War of 1812 is seen in Jackson's eagerness to lead the expedition to take possession of West Florida and thus extend "in this quarter the boundaries of the Republic to the Gulf of Mexico" and confer "a signal benefit on that section of the Union to which he belonged" (p. 27). The Creek War and the dramatic victory at New Orleans made Jackson "the idol and incarnation of the West" (p. 44), a popularity increased by the Seminole War and the "Conquest of Florida", despite its irregularities. So when chosen in 1828, after being cheated, in his estimation, out of the election in 1824, he was, "as no President before him, the choice of the masses" (p. 113). He came into power "as the standard-bearer of a mighty democratic uprising which was destined before it ran its course to break down oligarchical party or organizations, to liberalize state and local governments, and to turn the stream of national politics into wholly new channels" (p. 114). The issue of nationalism against particularism is the theme of the chapters on "the Webster-Hayne Debate" and "Tariff and Nullification." The author, while maintaining that Webster's was "the logic of the larger phase of the situation" and that the Union for which he pleaded was "the Union in which, by the fourth decade under the Constitution, a majority of the people of the United States had come to believe" (p. 156), admits that "the facts of history were on the side of Hayne" (p. 155).

He recognizes the real grievances of the South in "the steadily mounting tariffs" which were working to her "economic disadvantage" (p. 143); her conviction that Northern manufacturers and Western farmers intended to maintain this unfair policy; and her knowledge that the President had no keen interest in the tariff controversy. Nullification was the recourse of South Carolina. On nullification, however, Jackson did feel keenly, so he announced his doctrine, "Our Union! It must be preserved", and made this doctrine effective. Circumstances, however, altered cases with "Old Hickory". So he sympathized with Georgia in her efforts to crush the Cherokees and winked at her nullification of John Marshall's decree. In harmony also with the western prejudices he destroyed the National Bank. There does not seem, however, to be anything "extraordinary" in a President's vetoing a measure on constitutional grounds, even when the court has spoken. Courts sometimes change their minds. Andrew Jackson was determined to be President. He indicated the theory of "executive independence" and

in so doing Mr. Ogg thinks he broke new ground. He "reshaped men's conception of the presidency and helped make that office the power that it is to-day" (p. 236).

In Mr. Ogg's volume the honest, virile, irascible, chivalric, iron-willed, patriotic "General" Jackson and his battles with Indians, law-breakers, red-coats, nullifiers, aristocrats, John Adams, John Marshall, and the Whigs stand out in fresh and strong lines again.

D. R. ANDERSON.

*The Conquest of the Old Southwest: the Romantic Story of the Early Pioneers into Virginia, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and Kentucky, 1740-1790.* By ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, Ph.D., D.C.L. (New York: Century Company. 1920. Pp. xxiv, 395. \$2.50.)

ONE expects from Mr. Henderson a well-told story, and this volume realizes this expectation. In about four hundred pages there has been condensed a narrative of the advance of the Americans into the region of the southwest, particularly into Tennessee, that will interest the scientific historian as well as the lay reader.

This general praise of the book calls for the establishment of very definite limitations. Although in his title and subtitle Mr. Henderson claims to have covered the whole Old Southwest with the possible exception of lands bordering the Gulf, he has in general centred his narrative around two events, the Transylvania Company enterprise and the Revolutionary War in the modern state of Tennessee. The years and the territory lying just outside of the time and scene of these events have received scant treatment. The westward push of the Virginians into Kentucky, the intrigues of the land speculators, the question of the provincial soldiers' rights, the significance of the laying out of Louisville—this last event not even being mentioned—the claim of the Indiana Company in modern West Virginia, are all granted inadequate treatment. The Vandalia Company, around which played so much politics both in America and in the mother country, receives only half a page, whereas to the Transylvania Company are devoted two chapters without counting the two others depicting the activities of the company's agent, Daniel Boone. The struggle of Tennessee for statehood is treated at length, whereas the equally important effort on the part of Kentucky is granted a few paragraphs. Very significant events affecting the Old Southwest were taking place during these years in West Florida, but the name of that colony does not appear in the index.

Mr. Henderson adds another authority to be quoted in favor of the popular apotheosis of Daniel Boone, to whose story he devotes two chapters full of eulogy. Boone has been fortunate in his biographers, who have told his story in such a way that popular fancy has pictured him as the first man to visit the blue-grass region of Kentucky. Mr. Henderson, himself, names many who had preceded this doughty hunter,



but by no means all. From the end of the seventeenth century French and American hunting parties were frequent visitors to Kentucky and Tennessee, and had been so successful that it was said in 1767 that the game there was scarce. By 1768 the whole region was fairly well known to many English-speaking visitors and hundreds of boatmen had floated on the Ohio past its shores. Mr. Henderson mentions a few voyages (p. 120) and dismisses them with the following, "though interesting enough in themselves, [they] had little bearing upon the larger phases of westward expansion".

There are a few errors in the book that should be noted. Céloron de Blainville, and not Céleron de Bienville, was the French officer who was sent in to the Ohio valley in 1748. The Cherokee were never so favorable to the French as is stated on page 49. The traditional interpretation of the importance of Governor Spotswood's expedition to the mountains is retained. It is not yet proved that the British in the Northwest offered bounties for American scalps (p. 261). Unfortunately a line or more has been dropped by printer's carelessness at the bottom of page 193; aside from this, the book is very free from typographical errors.

From what has been said it is evident that there are grave limitations to Mr. Henderson's interpretation of Old Southwest history; but if the reader is interested in the Watauga settlement, in the Transylvania experiment, in the battle of King's Mountain, in the Indian wars of Tennessee, in the abortive attempt to establish the state of Franklin, and in a fine interpretation of the character and spirit of the frontiersmen, he will find the narrative very valuable.

C. W. ALVORD.

*Adventurers of Oregon: a Chronicle of the Fur Trade.* By CONSTANCE L. SKINNER. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XXII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1920. Pp. x, 290.)

THIS book is a delight. The author treats the dramatic scenes and incidents in the background of Oregon's history, achieving therein a wholly unusual degree of literary perfection. Thus she has produced a narrative which, for adult readers, deserves to take very high rank in its special field. That field the subtitles, eight in number, help to define although each of these again calls for some analysis. The titles are: the River of the West, Lewis and Clark, the Reign of the Trapper, the *Tonquin*, Astor's Overlanders, Astoria under the Nor'westers, and the King of Old Oregon. The period covered is from the beginnings of exploration to the settlement of the Oregon boundary dispute in 1846, and the themes represented by the above chapter-heads are essentially two—Discovery and Exploration, and the Fur-Trade.

In her treatment the author exhibits a good knowledge of the facts, a comprehension of relations, critical insight, and a mastery of artistic arrangement rarely excelled. Her critical acumen is manifested not

merely in the correct analysis of documents, a common enough accomplishment, but in that higher intellectual gift which enables its possessor to interpret complex human situations. It is illustrated, for example, in the discerning criticisms passed on Hunt's leadership of the overland Astorians.

The fur-trade history is an exceedingly complicated subject, difficult to organize. Chapter III. of this book gives an admirable sketch of that history from "the first Indian who stepped forward to offer a beaver pelt to a man of our race in exchange for some trinket made in Europe", through the intricacies of the French, Hudson Bay, Canadian, and Missouri trading activities, to the inauguration of Astor's continental plan. The remainder of the book, practically, is on the fur-trade of the Oregon country.

This limitation of scope is fortunate, for at the few points where the author strays into the less exciting domains of diplomacy, politics, missionary enterprise, or emigration, interest declines and her grip on the original materials relaxes. The treatment of those topics suggests that they formed no organic part of her serious studies and are merely intrusive, disturbing elements in the narrative. The space devoted to them is almost negligible, but on account of the excellence of the main part of the book it is the more necessary to call attention to some of the misconceptions which mar these few paragraphs. When the author says (pp. 252-253): "On McLoughlin's advice, Whitman went to the Cayuse Indians about five miles west of Walla Walla, and Spalding established himself at Lapwai on the Clearwater among the Nez Percés", she ignores the results of Parker's survey which revealed the most eligible sites for missions. The agency of McLoughlin in distributing American missionaries over the country is strangely exaggerated, as when she says (p. 256): "Whitman and Spalding, McLoughlin had sent to different tribes, so that each tribe should have but one white leader of light and thus should not be confused by a divided authority", as if the missionaries, and their National Board, had no policy of their own! To say, as the author does (p. 262), speaking of the revised provisional government: "The new government was opposed by the British settlers and by Douglas. But McLoughlin supported it and contributed to its first exchequer", is to go contrary to two stubborn documentary facts: (a) the Canadian settlers' address, in which the British element declare in favor of a provisional government, and (b) the agreement of July 15, 1845, between the Hudson's Bay Company and the officers of the provisional government, which was signed, on the part of the company, by both McLoughlin and Douglas. Other similar faults could be mentioned, and there are a few slips in citations—*Gilbert*, for *Gabriel* Franchere, for example. She also cites the 1905 edition of Schafer's *Pacific Northwest*, which has been superseded at many points by the 1918 edition.

But, we repeat, the book is a delight.

JOSEPH SCHAFER.

*John Archibald Campbell, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1853-1861.* By HENRY G. CONNOR, LL.D., Judge of the United States Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1920. Pp. viii, 310. \$2.25.)

STUDENTS of American law as well as historians interested in the Civil War period will welcome this concise and fair-minded biography. As a member of the Supreme Court from 1853 to 1861, as a participant in the Dred Scott decision, as mediator between the seceding states and the Union government in the days preceding the firing on Sumter, as assistant secretary of war under the Confederacy, as commissioner at the Hampton Roads conference of 1865, as mediator again with Lincoln at Richmond at the close of the war, Campbell of Alabama had unusual opportunities to serve the cause of justice and of peace. After a short imprisonment in 1865 he spent the remainder of his life as a practising lawyer in New Orleans. The biographer's judicial experience gives him an advantage in the treatment of legal points, while his sense of restraint eliminates bias in the discussion of matters that ordinarily arouse the keenest controversy. The Campbell manuscripts have evidently been used, but the annotations unfortunately contain no specific references to unpublished sources. One of the most useful chapters is that which summarizes Campbell's career as a justice of the Supreme Court. His opinions, many of which were in dissent from his colleagues, were in line with the traditions of states' rights, strict construction, and the Jeffersonian emphasis upon individual liberty as opposed to governmental restraint. Thus he opposed monopolies, resisted the treatment of corporations as "citizens", favored the right of the people of Ohio to tax corporations in a manner which the majority of the court regarded as impairment of contract, and opposed the extension of federal admiralty jurisdiction over internal waters. He would not use the courts as centralizing agencies and consistently sought to uphold the common law and the principles of local self-government. In the chapter devoted to the Dred Scott decision (chap. III.) the distinction between Campbell's point of view and that of Chief Justice Taney is noted. Denying that Scott's absence from Missouri effected his manumission under Missouri law, Campbell avoided the "academic question" whether a freeman of African descent could be a "citizen"—a question which Taney emphasized. No light is thrown upon the oft-discussed question of "collusion" between the executive and the court in the Dred Scott case, and the portion of the decision which bears upon the unconstitutionality of the Missouri Compromise law of 1820 is touched but lightly, the author remarking (p. 72) that this question has only "historical interest". Chapter VIII. treats Campbell's argument before the Supreme Court in the Slaughter-house cases. Campbell opposed the monopoly set up by the Louisiana law and, in spite of

his states' rights convictions, insisted upon a sweeping application of the Fourteenth Amendment to protect all citizens from denial of privileges or property by state legislative act.

The author's method of treating the Seward-Campbell negotiations of March-April, 1861, is to incorporate Campbell's *Facts of History* in full, with accompanying notes and letters (thus imparting a source-value to his book), and then to quote the conclusions of Rhodes, White, Schouler, Botts, and Schleiden, the Hanseatic minister-resident at Washington. His concern is to clear Campbell, but he is nevertheless generous toward Lincoln and even toward Seward in the Sumter affair. When treating the Hampton Roads conference, however, the author neither incorporates nor summarizes Campbell's "Memorandum" prepared soon after the conference—an indispensable historical source which is difficult of access. Unfortunately even the reference to this document (note, p. 165) is incorrect. Various significant points in the conference are omitted while the author argues at considerable length to show that Lincoln did not actually make a "proposition" for the appropriation of \$400,000,000 as compensation to slave-owners—a point which would be easily conceded. The method of inserting quoted portions is at times confusing, and there are numerous inaccuracies of quotation, the meaning being spoiled in some cases (*e. g.*, pp. 29, 34) by the unintentional omission of words or phrases.

J. G. RANDALL.

*The Railroad Builders: a Chronicle of the Welding of the States.*

By JOHN MOODY. [Chronicles of America Series, vol. XXXVIII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1919. Pp. x, 257.)

*The Masters of Capital: a Chronicle of Wall Street.* By JOHN MOODY. [*Id.*, vol. XLI.] (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. ix, 234.)

*The Armies of Labor: a Chronicle of the Organized Wage-Earners.* By SAMUEL P. ORTH. [*Id.*, vol. XL.] (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. ix, 279.)

THESE are three of the later volumes of a series of fifty distinct but associated monographs upon American history, published under the general editorship of Professor Allen Johnson, and of which many preceding volumes have already been reviewed in this journal. Economic movements have their part in the series; the three books immediately in view lie mainly in that field.

Both of Mr. Moody's contributions to the series are of a narrative rather than an analytical or critical character. They are either relations of conspicuous financial episodes or accounts of the origin, growth, and alliances of great banking firms and railway systems. This arrangement of material naturally causes some repetition, and it leaves to the reader the task of correlating the common features which have

characterized successive stages of our economic history, and which are incidentally illustrated rather than identified and explained by the author. Though these books fill an appropriate place in the series and serve a useful historical purpose, we fancy that many who read them will regret that Mr. Moody confined himself so largely to description, and did not so organize his materials as to make them fulfill a more definitely interpretative function. He was qualified to do this; for in the first half-dozen paragraphs of *The Masters of Capital* he gives a remarkably concise and illuminating summary of the evolution of speculative and concentrated capital in the United States, which might well serve as a syllabus for an entire volume.

Both books are written from the Wall Street standpoint. They are panoramas painted from a single position, portraying our vast agricultural and industrial empire from the perspective of a Manhattan skyscraper. That is perhaps the best single observation post one could choose, especially for a survey of organized capital and its masters. But in a country so large as ours magnitudes unavoidably lose their true proportions when viewed from any one centre. Forces which seem to originate in New York merely find that city a convenient focus; and the financial dictators of the metropolis are not the dynamic factors in our history that they seem to be to those who hover within the immediate radiance of their golden aura.

Particularly is this true of our railway builders. Were speculators like Gould and Drew, who merely manipulated stocks, or even more legitimate financiers like Commodore Vanderbilt, who combined with this the finding of funds for developing or restoring existing roads, really entitled to monopolize that designation? Surely the men of initiative and vision who first grasped the possibilities of new routes and territories, the engineers and technicians who created the American railway type, and the administrators who perfected our methods of operation, contain among their number those who are also entitled to this designation. And even among railway financiers were there not men of eminent service whose names are not recorded in Wall Street annals? Yet it is well that stress should be laid upon railway capital organization—a topic of so much recent and present interest—especially in a work intended for the general reader rather than for the research student or the economist.

A few statements should be queried. While William Kelly invented independently a pneumatic process for decarbonizing iron, a metallurgist would hardly say that he “discovered and perfected the Bessemer process well in advance of Sir Henry Bessemer”. There seems to us an erroneous implication in the statement that during the late war “all European countries, even including England, resorted to various currency expedients that amounted practically to inflation. The United States resorted to no such unscientific expedients as it had tried in the Civil War but met the demands of the hour by supplying an elastic

emergency currency under the terms of the new Federal Reserve Act". Personally we doubt whether the change of label on our two war currencies has been accompanied by a material change in their real character.

However, Mr. Moody has given us two interesting, authoritative, and impartial narratives describing dramatic and not unimportant episodes in our economic history. And his firm biographies and stories of great financial deals—accompanied as they are by a constant flow of informing comment—enable an understanding reader to deduce more than he specifically tells.

Professor Orth's volume, *The Armies of Labor*, possesses three excellent qualities: it is readable, concise, and comprehensive. It keeps close to its main purpose of being historical and descriptive. There is no direct attempt to interpret the labor movement in the terms of a social philosophy or in favor of any theory of social reform. The author evidently sympathizes with trade unionism and admires highly some trade union leaders. He decidedly favors the traditional and conservative, as distinguished from the new and radical, aspects of labor policy. The Americanism of his viewpoint has not been affected by the recent European and cosmopolitan ideology which has begun to influence, and is destined to influence still more in the future, all social movements in this country. But in surveying the past it is sometimes an advantage not to have the vision blurred by the cross-light of a perhaps too lurid sunrise.

As the subtitle suggests, this volume is a history of the labor movement as expressed through workers' organizations, rather than of labor conditions. It touches only incidentally upon wages, hours of work, and other features of the labor contract at different periods, or upon the details of labor legislation. Within these limits it covers the field, and indeed is in many ways a model of what a popular summary of a special topic in social or economic history should be. While the author cites mostly secondary sources, he is more than a compiler. He does not bring us new data or original theories; but even a student familiar with his sources will find the book worth reading.

All three volumes are well indexed and contain useful bibliographical appendixes. They are convenient in form and very attractive in typographical appearance.

VICTOR S. CLARK.

*From Midshipman to Rear-Admiral.* By Rear-Admiral BRADLEY A. FISKE, U.S.N. (New York: Century Company. 1919. Pp. xi, 694. \$6.00.)

It would hardly be possible to write a book of naval life covering a service of forty-nine years without making it entertaining, if only because of the inevitable variety and adventure and intimate knowledge of the great institution, the United States Navy. In this book there is

abundance of variety and adventure of the kind that is met in ships at sea, as well as the absorbing and impressive details of the management of the great United States Navy, and it is set forth with that peculiar combination of zest and force and clearness which marks all that Admiral Fiske has written.

But the narrative in this book is much more than one of adventure at sea, for it narrates a story of the efforts of expert naval officers to build an efficient navy and of successful and unsuccessful inventions, that is far more unusual and far more interesting than most stories of sea experience, and one finds the existence of many situations such as Herbert Spencer would have characterized as "pivotal" points, when a decision different from the decision adopted would have made a radical change in the history of the United States Navy and possibly of the World War.

Admiral Fiske was able to serve successfully and with high credit in all the grades of the most exacting profession that we know of, and yet to make more successful and important inventions of a naval and military kind than any other man who has ever lived. How he ever found the time to do it, and how he ever was able to keep up inventing, despite the continual discouragement he received, may well make us marvel. It may well make us deplore also that so much of a gifted inventor's time and energy was wasted in overcoming an opposition that should not have been exerted; and it may make us wonder how much Admiral Fiske would have accomplished, if government officials had been so wise as to try to utilize his talents, instead of trying to smother them. When one realizes the enormous value to nations that new weapons have always had, when one realizes the importance to Constantinople, for instance, of the secret of Greek fire, the importance to Prussia of the needle-gun, the importance to the Northerners of the *Monitor* in the Civil War, etc., one must deplore the foolish mistreatment of Bradley A. Fiske that his biography presents.

Great as was the service that Fiske did with his inventions, however, it may be doubted if it was really as great as that which he performed in getting our navy ready for the World War that has just ended. The present investigation of the navy by the Senate Naval Committee, even if it does not eventually show as deplorable a state of unpreparedness as Admiral Sims reported, has already developed the fact that the navy was not as prepared as it should have been. Whatever preparedness it did have must have been due largely to Admiral Fiske's efforts, supported by other progressive naval officers, for as his book sets forth, and as has not been denied, it was he who secured the legislation which preserved the organization of the Navy Department by which it was prepared for the war and handled during the war, and without which it would have been almost helpless, either to prepare or to operate. To make the matter more extraordinary, Admiral Fiske accomplished what he did in secret, in spite of the opposition of the Secretary of the Navy



himself to the organization established, in direct disobedience of the regulations for the government of the navy, and, therefore, at the risk of his commission as an officer. I know of no similar incident in any navy or army.

The crowning act of Fiske's life, up to the time when his narrative closes, was a failure from one point of view and a success from another. The act was the invention of his torpedoplane, by which the launching of a submarine torpedo from an aeroplane was made practicable, and the insistence on his part that this invention, and bombing aeroplanes as well, should be utilized in the Great War for sinking German ships with torpedoes and for preventing the German submarines from getting into the deep water in which they could submerge. Both Fiske's invention and his proposal were rejected by Secretary Daniels, as shown by the Secretary's letter dated May 20, 1918, reproduced in the book, and therefore may be called failures. But both were just about to be used when the armistice was signed, and both are now recognized as the means that should have been accepted when Fiske proposed them; while the torpedoplane has now been adopted as a major instrument of warfare. It is most amazing to find that the letter referred to, refused to permit Admiral Fiske to conduct experiments with torpedoplanes, stating that the Allies had discontinued such experiments, for causes stated. We know now that the opposite was true! Both, therefore, may now be called successes, even though they were prevented by High Authority from making that distinctly American and powerful contribution to the winning of the war, which we now know they could have made.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*Some Sources of Human History.* By W. M. Flinders Petrie. (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York, Macmillan Company, 1919, pp. 128, \$1.25.) "The purpose of these outlines", says the author, "is to show some of the interests of human history to those who are neither specialists nor students." "The object has been to look over the country on each side of the beaten tracks of history teaching, and see some of the distant views and green fields." In "human history" Mr. Petrie includes the whole existence of man on earth, and in his first and longest chapter, Unwritten History, he sketches, as anthropologist and archaeologist, the rise of prehistoric man and of his art, noting especially the worth of roads and streets, and names and architecture as sources of our knowledge. A second chapter, Byways of Written History, deals chattily with sources for the story of man outside of Europe, with ancient science and its remains, with coins, papyri, weights and measures, and with authors whom the writer thinks neglected. A third, on Habit, Custom, and Law, illustrates the worth of these for history.

If the aim of the booklet be only to interest, it achieves its end. It admirably shows how diverse are the sources of history, and with what zest an expansive old scholar can with their help range over the whole past of man, giving free rein to fancy and to prejudice. But it concerns itself less with sources than with their interpretation, and it would not be easy to compile a book that less suggests the need to the historian of rigorous training and patient industry, of detachment and equity and long suspension of judgment. Its readers are more likely to lay it down with the notion that in history research is fearless inference, and one swallow quite enough to make a summer.

*Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the last Half-Century of the Roman Republic.* By Richard Orlando Jolliffe. (Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta, 1919, pp. xi, 109, \$1.25.) The period covered by this book is well chosen for the purpose which the writer has in mind, because in it he can make use of the detailed information to be found in the orations against Verres and in Cicero's letters, and especially of the intimate account which Cicero gives of conditions in Cilicia. In his four chapters the writer deals with the army and navy, and with client princes and embassies. Probably most readers will find the greatest amount of new information in the second and third chapters. Every student of Roman history knows that extortion, peculation, and bribery were common in the government of the provinces during the later years of the Republic, but the pertinent facts have never been brought together before in so complete and convincing a way. The reviewer would have liked to see the underlying causes of this corrupt state of affairs set forth somewhat more fully than they appear in this book. So far as the machinery of government goes, they may be found in the absence of an itemized legislative budget, in the fact that a system of strict accounts was not enforced, in the autocratic power of provincial officials, in the difficulty of bringing witnesses to Rome from remote points, and in the absence of a public prosecutor. The more fundamental reasons for the prevalence of corruption, however, lay in the fact that in dealing with other peoples the Roman conscience had become hardened by a long series of wars of conquest, and that the weaker peoples who came under Roman control had no adequate means of protection. The available sources furnish the author with a deal of information on four important episodes, *viz.*, the career of Verres, the Egyptian intrigue, Cicero's year in Cilicia, and the experiences of Ariobarzanes, and these incidents are analyzed with great acuteness. For his theory that Cicero was named as governor of Cilicia for the purpose of collecting the money which Ariobarzanes owed Pompey, the author makes out a very good case (p. 70 f.). The arrangement of the book is excellent, and the style good. To speak of a small matter, in the reviewer's opinion the "Conclusion" might better have been

omitted. We should like to see the author supplement this paper by a study of the same subject in the time of Tacitus and Pliny.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

*The Transformation of Early Christianity from an Eschatological to a Socialized Movement.* By Lyford Paterson Edwards, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology in St. Stephen's College. (Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1919, pp. 94, \$1.50.) The dissertation of Dr. Lyford Paterson Edwards is related to an historical problem, the transition from the eschatological form of early Christianity to that of a social institution participating in the world's historic tasks. The data employed are historical facts honestly acquired by the author's personal investigation. The data, however, do not fully represent early Christianity and the historical process of change is not exhibited fully or in sequence. Certain ideas and attitudes are selected and whatever of historic change is found is explained by principles popular with psychologists and sociologists. For example, the thousand-years reign of the saints was largely an expression of masochism and the decline of Chiliasm is to be explained by the transfer of the masochistic elements to other forms of expression, partly to the idea of the Catholic Church, more largely to the idea of purgatory and organized monachism. Chiliasm also was largely the psychic equivalent of the suppressed patriotism of Phrygia, Egypt, and North Africa under Roman rule—the escape of a repressed Freudian complex. The other explanatory means employed are crowd psychology, economic determinism, imitation (*à la Tarde*), and Veblen's Conspicuous Honorific Consumption. The appraisal of the book must be left to other scientists than the historian. Latin syntax and English spelling have not been mastered by Dr. Edwards.

*Henry the Sixth: a Reprint of John Blacman's Memoir.* With Translation and Notes by M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Provost of Eton. (Cambridge, University Press, 1919, pp. xvi, 60, 5 sh.) This little tract sets forth the cloistral virtues of the weak-minded grandson of the weak-minded Charles VI. of France. King Henry was the founder of Eton and of King's College, Cambridge, and this reprint and translation is obviously an *opus pietatis*. The new edition is carefully done, with preface, variant readings, notes; in short, it has as complete a critical apparatus as is possible for a memoir which is extant only in print. The unfortunate king is shown as a *dévôt*, a weak replica of St. Louis, without any of his commonsense or strength. Henry's pudicity—*pudicitia ejus*—is more than adequate. "For before he was married, being as a youth a pupil of chastity, he would keep careful watch through hidden windows of his chamber, lest any foolish impertinence of women coming into the house should grow to a head, and cause the fall of any of his household" (p. 30). A royal occupation! If Blacman, a Carthusian, is inaccurate, we have at least what Blacman thought admirable

in a king. The tract throws tiny rays of light on fifteenth-century manners. In any case it is well to have it put in print again, for by consulting it one may learn how little is to be learned from it.

G. C. S.

*Der Anteil der Schweizer an den Italienischen Kriegen, 1494-1516.* Von Ernst Gagliardi. Band I. *Von Karls VIII. Zug nach Neapel bis zur Liga von Cambrai, 1494-1509.* (Zurich, Schulthess und Co., 1919, pp. xiii, 909, 3.80 fr.) The decisive participation of the Swiss in the European wars of the period indicated gave employment to the talents of numerous historians who treated the various episodes in monographic or more voluminous form, but it is now a little over a century since the Italian wars here described were treated as a whole. In the meanwhile a great amount of documentary material has come to light and been recorded in print, and a few special students have elucidated much that was obscure. In these investigations the present author has already taken part in his book on the rise and fall of the Swiss Confederation as a world power in the sixteenth century, and now comes forward with a more extensive work on the Italian expeditions.

The title should not lead anyone to assume that the present volume is a purely military or regimental history in which the deeds of individuals or commands are displayed or glorified. On the contrary it is an elaborate description of the political conditions in Italy interwoven with accounts of the military enterprises sent into that arena successively by Charles VIII. of France, Maximilian of Germany, and Louis XII. of France. In the midst of this, Switzerland appears as the recruiting ground for European armies on all sides and a focus of political activities which had fateful results for the contestants and serious moral and political consequences for the Swiss.

Upon the familiar situation Dr. Gagliardi brings to bear a wealth of erudition which makes the work a part of European history, while for Switzerland itself it helps to lay foundations for the Reformation movement and the history of that confederation as a neutral state. His introductory chapters on the political, economic, and social conditions of the Swiss are clear-cut and illuminating, as are likewise his comments on those points as they appear from time to time in the body of the narrative. It is more than ever evident that Switzerland was not simply a wild spot where good soldiers were to be found, but was fully in the whirlpool of European politics, the centre of which was for the time being in Italy, whose activities are here so comprehensively described.

J. M. VINCENT.

*The Manchester Grammar School, 1515-1915: a Regional Study of the Advancement of Learning in Manchester since the Reformation.* By Alfred A. Mumford. (London and New York, Longmans, Green,

and Company, 1919, pp. xi, 563, \$8.50.) This volume has seventeen chapters with twenty-one appendixes of documents, tracing the history of the Manchester School for three hundred years. The author is more interested in the personal history of its benefactors, directors, masters, and graduates, than he is in detailed information regarding the school's management, support, system of education, etc., at various periods. This is somewhat disappointing to the American student. Apparently the important original records of the school, before 1724, are not extant, and this may account for the scarcity of information on the early period. On the other hand the volume is much more than a history of one school or even of the educational forces and agencies in Manchester. There is much of value on the educational and intellectual development of England in general, and comment on the larger factors of an economic, social, and religious character, which influenced the course of this development.

The titles of some of the earlier chapters will illustrate the point of view: *e. g.*, ch. III., Presbyterian Discipline, Learning, and Politics, 1643-1660; ch. IV., the Rise of Naturalism and the Liberalization of Learning, 1660-1689; ch. VI., Whig Benefactions and Widening Interests, 1689-1720; ch. VIII., Privilege, Patronage, and Public Service, 1749-1780.

The main thread of the story has to do with the struggle to democratize the school and to supplant the old classical curriculum with one which would more directly meet the new economic and social conditions ushered in by the Industrial Revolution. This portion of the book is better written and more informing than the earlier. There are, however, documents in the appendixes which throw light on the conditions in the seventeenth century.

The author admits (preface) that he has approached the subject "not so much from the point of view of an historian, critically studying past records, as from that of a naturalist" who wishes to know something of the circumstances of early development in order "to understand the conditions of growth of a living organism". Perhaps this accounts in part for the omission of many references to sources of information, much to be desired, and the lack of a bibliography. There are numerous illustrations of Manchester, the school and notables connected with it, and a good index. The book is a creditable piece of work, even if it does not measure up to the high standard of scholarship which other writers have set in their histories of similar schools.

M. W. JERNEGAN.

*The Sovereignty of the British Seas.* Written in the Year 1633 by Sir John Borroughs, Keeper of the Records in the Tower of London. Edited with Introductory Essay and Notes by Thomas Callander Wade, M.B.E., M.A., LL.B. (Edinburgh, W. Green and Son, Ltd., 1920, pp. viii, 115, 7 sh. 6 d.) "And therefore the Sovereignty of our Seas being the

most precious Jewell of his Majesties Crowne, and (next under God) the principall meanes of our Wealth and Safetie, all true English hearts and hands are bounded by all possible means and diligence to preserve and maintaine the same, even with the uttermost hazzard of their lives, their goods and fortunes." With these words Sir John Borough, or Boroughs, closed his argument, prepared for Charles I. during his controversy with the Dutch over the North Sea fisheries, first published during the Commonwealth, on the eve of its Dutch war, and republished in 1739 during the difficulty with Spain over sea sovereignty. Avoiding the example of Selden in his more famous treatise, Borough dispensed with legal arguments and citations from Scripture and classical mythology, and based upon official documents his proofs of the antiquity of the claim to sovereignty over the British seas, and the recognition of that claim by other nations. He discretely avoided any delimitation of those waters, and gave a large proportion of his attention to the question of fishing rights, appending a disquisition, illustrated by the theme of the growth of Dutch prosperity, upon the value of fisheries to national development.

The introductory essay on the freedom of the sea covers the main features of the controversy down to Boroughs's time. Acquaintance with the results of the most recent research on the papal bulls of demarcation would have saved the editor from some inaccuracies on that subject, and it seems unfortunate to omit all references to the defense of sea freedom by sixteenth-century Frenchmen. On all matters relating to the British seas, however, Mr. Wade shows mastery of his sources. He has collated the existing manuscripts and editions with great care, and his notes supply the essential corrections and confirmations. The republication of this once famous pamphlet at this time and in this form is a useful contribution toward the understanding of the historical background of British sentiment concerning the freedom of the seas.

LOUISE FARGO BROWN.

*The Day of the Crescent: Glimpses of Old Turkey.* By G. E. Hubbard. (Cambridge, University Press, 1929, pp. xi, 242, 15 sh.) The author appears to have taken all of his material from a row of books which he discovered on a shelf at the British Foreign Office, a collection made by a diplomat of the nineteenth century. They are not so rare as he appears to believe. Since the days of Elizabeth the English public has been steadily interested in the Near East, and upon the appearance of every interesting book about the region has absorbed editions that were large for the time. As a consequence the large libraries of the western world have as a rule not only most of the writings drawn upon by Mr. Hubbard, but others of the same period of equal interest and value in reconstructing the Ottoman Turkish past. It is true, however,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—9.

that such old works about Turkey are little read nowadays, and therefore the present book will have a freshness of appeal to the general public at which it is aimed.

The author calls his work "a humble attempt to create a picture of the golden age of Turkey", but he later describes it more accurately as "a collection of picturesque sketches". He has certainly made no wide search for material, nor approached his subject in any critical way, nor attempted to give close unity to his scheme. His task has been almost exclusively the condensation of the writings of certain travellers and observers, mostly used in the English original or English translation. One noteworthy exception—Barbaro's Journey to Persia of about 1471, written in Italian—falls neither in time nor in geography within the general scope of the book. The author has not thought it necessary to follow a chronological order of arrangement, nor to harmonize the varying uses of Eastern names and expressions which he finds in his sources. He has tried, however, to supply accurately a limited amount of historical background and explanatory comment.

Under these conditions Mr. Hubbard has succeeded in presenting a vivacious, interesting, and thoroughly readable book. He drew extensively upon the Letters of Busbecq: here he might well have used Arnold and Forster's translation instead of that of 1694, which he has followed to the extent of using the Latinized forms Busbequius and Malvezius. Next in assignment of space is Baron Wratislaw, whose "adventures" are skillfully summarized. Other travellers followed are Dallam, Donado, Haji Khalfa, John Fox the gunner, Dr. Covell, George Sandys, and Bennetti. The sixteen full-page illustrations are mainly from the contemporary works of Nicolay, George Sandys, and Grelot. There is an analyzed table of contents, but no index.

A few errors may be noted. The English is occasionally original, as "unrelentless" (p. 10) and "unchartered seas" (p. 150). The Prince (or Voivode) of Wallachia in 1683 (not 1682) was not "Contacuzenos", but Cantacuzene. Janissaries and pages are not properly discriminated (p. 29). Aruj Barbarossa was dead long before 1533 (p. 145). Turkey had in 1669 many possessions farther west than Crete (p. 185). The illustration facing page 214 entitled "Eastern Entrance to Bosphorus (the site of the 'Black Tower') " is incorrect in the parenthetical alternative, for the "Black Tower" was in the wall of the Castle of Rumeli Hissar, from which the Black Sea is not visible.

A. H. LYBYER.

*Jan Pietersz. Coen.* Bescheiden omtrent zijn Bedrijf in Indië, verzameld door Dr. H. T. Colenbrander. Uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. Eerste deel. (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1919, pp. xix, 854.) The Royal Institute for Dutch India decided in 1918 to celebrate the three-hundredth anniversary of the conquest of Jacatra (May 30, 1619), by



the publication of a work which should include the reports of Jan Pieterssen Coen, and documents relating to his life and work. Dr. Colenbrander was chosen to edit the work, which was projected in five parts as follows: I. Coen's letters to the Netherlands, 1614-1623; II. Coen's letters to different parts of India, 1615-1623; III. resolutions and decisions made at Bantam and Batavia, 1613-1623; IV. letters of the directors to Coen, 1614-1622, reports relating to Coen's work, 1623-1627; V. documents relating to Coen's second term of office as governor general, 1627-1629. The first part of the work now appears in a handsome volume, admirably printed on heavy paper with luxurious margins.

The content of the book has an importance which justifies this generous treatment. Coen is the outstanding figure in the founding of the Dutch empire in the East. After some years of service in the East India Company he was made director general in 1614 and governor general in 1617; the reports in this volume cover the period from 1613, when Coen arrived in Bantam, to 1623 when he returned to the Netherlands. In this decade the territorial establishment of the East India Company and some important elements of its policy were shaped, largely by Coen's influence, along the lines which they followed, in the main, in later history.

Coen had his eye on the whole field of Dutch interests in Asia, from Arabia and Persia to China and Japan. He described the conditions and problems, political and commercial, at every point of contact with the native peoples, and the struggle for mastery with European competitors, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish. To the constant demands of the directors at home for money and goods he sent answers describing in detail the sources of revenue and the processes of trade, the ships and how they were handled, the wares and how they were got, and explaining his own demands for help that would enable him to build up a healthy organization able to protect itself from the dangers menacing it both within and without.

Extracts from these reports have already been printed by De Jonge, in his *Opkomst van het Nederlandsch Gezag over Java*, and by Tiele, in his *Bouwstoffen voor de Geschiedenis der Nederlanders in den Maleischen Archipel*. These extracts, making up altogether perhaps one-quarter of the material in the present volume, are printed here in their original context, with new material from the archives which seems to be for many purposes fully as important as that which has already appeared in print. Students who are not specialists in the period will await with interest a study of Coen's life and work, based on the documents, which is promised by the editor to appear in a later volume. Meanwhile, those who desire to consult the work for its contribution to their particular interests, will find its use facilitated by three indexes, one of persons, one of places and peoples, and one of ships.

CLIVE DAY.

*English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne, 1702-1710.* By William Thomas Morgan, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of European History in Indiana University. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, vol. VII.] (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1920, pp. 427, \$2.75.) In this book the author embodies the results of many years of painstaking and fruitful research. He has carefully studied "the new evidence that has become available in the last thirty years"—in the archives of England and Holland, in the recent reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, as well as in a mass of pamphlets and periodicals—and has reread, with a keen eye, all the older literature on the period, including the materials on which it has been based. Building on such secure and broad foundations he has succeeded in constructing a sound and enduring work. Particularly he has been able to show that Queen Anne was a much more assertive person than is commonly believed, and that, from the beginning, the Duchess of Marlborough exercised much less influence on the policy of her sovereign than most writers on the period have assumed. In this contention Professor Morgan has followed the lead of Archdeacon Coxe and Dean Swift, strengthening, with additional evidence, their views which have hitherto received small consideration. In the opinion of the reviewer, however, his attempt to clear Marlborough of responsibility for prolonging the War of the Spanish Succession is less convincing. On this perplexing period when personalities counted for so much, and when cabinet and party government were still in such an inchoate state, new lights are thrown; moreover, much fresh vivid detail is presented on the iniquitous methods of conducting elections which had come into vogue. On the other hand, the author's enthusiasm and thoroughness have tempted him to draw out unduly some of the intrigues and controversies of those graceless years, while his interest in tracking down questionable statements and opinions has led him to cite too indiscriminately all who have touched on his subject. In his exhaustive list, Miss Keith, Overton, and Lord Wolseley are apparently the only authors not included.

There are possibly a few points to which one might take exception. In the account of the rise of parties the essential distinction is not emphasized that the opposition, before the Restoration, was generally organized to overthrow the existing government, while afterwards its main object was to get control of the administration. The Newcomen engine (p. 21) was not of a type that would have been very helpful in the factory system. Although Mary and Anne were brought up in the Protestant faith, their mother Anne Hyde died a Roman Catholic (p. 28). Bishop Compton was not "deposed", but only suspended from the exercise of his episcopal functions (p. 30). The characterizations of most of the personages of the period are excellent, but it might perhaps be better to call Godolphin a boor rather than a "bore" (p. 48) since he rarely said anything. Also, it would be more accurate to say that

the Mutiny Bill and the appropriation of supply made annual instead of "frequent" sessions imperative. Yet it would be disproportionate to dwell too much on these matters in a work so uniformly well done.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Britain and Greater Britain in the Nineteenth Century.* By Edward A. Hughes, M.A., Assistant Master at the Royal Naval College, Dartmouth, sometimes Major Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1919, pp. 295, 5 sh.) To achieve a history of Britain and the British Empire in the nineteenth century within the compass of less than three hundred pages requires gifts of selection and self-restraint not too commonly found among scholars. But Mr. Hughes has fairly risen to the occasion. He has written a straightforward, lucid narrative, noting with admirable accuracy and comprehensiveness all the more important social and political "events" and finding it possible now and then even to discuss their why and wherefore. On the whole it is the best short history of modern Britain that has appeared.

But there is one serious defect that greatly impairs its usefulness. Not only is there no bibliography but there are no references whatever. Touching as he does on a vast range of complex matters, Mr. Hughes nowhere gives any clue to his sources of information or any guide to further investigation. Not that we distrust his sources. His accuracy and soundness of judgment are good evidence that he has spared no pains to get at the truth. Even small mistakes are rare. Lord Carnarvon did not, of course, bring about the federation of the Canadian provinces, and the St. Lawrence is not frozen for six months of the year, but such things are only slips and they are not characteristic. The trouble is not with the author's mastery of his subject but with his attitude toward his reader. Writing for undergraduates and for the general public, he might surely have assumed that he would awaken some curiosity. The omission of all mention of sources, primary or secondary, is so uniform that it is evidently a matter of deliberate judgment. But the judgment was certainly a wrong one.

On the whole perhaps Mr. Hughes has made his book too much an epitome of external, securely dated facts to appeal to the "general reader". Good as it is, it is not particularly dynamic or illuminating. But as a text-book for the college teacher who can supply the missing perspective and dramatic action it is excellent, and should be as useful in America as in Great Britain. For it is by no means insular, and its sane, well-balanced view of Britain's relation to the rest of the world is one of the best features of the book.

CECIL FAIRFIELD LAVELL.

*Les Lois Françaises de 1815 à nos Jours, accompagnées des Documents Politiques les plus Importants.* Par L. Cahen, Professeur Agrégé d'Histoire au Lycée Condorcet, et A. Mathiez, Professeur d'Histoire à

la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Besançon. (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1919, pp. iii, 374, 5 fr.) This book was first published in 1906. In the main the new edition simply brings the original publication up to the eve of the World War. The new matter includes two additional documents upon the period of the Second Empire, three texts relating to the early stages of the Franco-Russian alliance, and about forty pages of documents belonging to the years 1904-1913. Nearly all of these new materials relate to the separation of Church and State, the Morocco question, and other international matters of great importance to France.

The work of the editors has been done with good judgment. Almost every document which one would expect to find in so small a collection is included. Wherever the length of a document precluded full publication the editors have almost invariably selected the most significant parts. The grouping into chapters is a skillful combination of the topical and chronological methods. Only in the matter of the finding apparatus is there occasion for adverse comment. There is no index and the system of numbering the documents could easily be made more convenient.

A few years ago an extensive use of such a volume in American college classes in history was scarcely practicable, because few of the students could read French easily. The situation ought to be different now. It is to be hoped that many teachers will act upon the presumption that the recent increase of interest in the study of French has removed the obstacle. Such teachers will find that this little book meets their requirements.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*John Redmond's Last Years.* By Stephen Gwynn. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1919, pp. viii, 351, \$5.00.) The author of this volume, though belonging to a well-known Unionist family of Ireland, was an Irish Nationalist member of Parliament and as such a political follower of Redmond. The principal purpose of his book, as stated by himself, "is to record and illustrate Redmond's action during the period which began with the opening of the Great War".

The first four chapters deal with Redmond's career as chairman of the Irish party before the war, the Home Rule Bill of 1912, and the organization of the rival volunteer forces in Ireland. They fill more than one-third of the book and form a rather lengthy introduction to the main theme. In them Mr. Gwynn makes clear his conviction that the shuffling Irish policy of the Asquith government, its supineness in the face of loyalist treason in Ulster, aided and abetted by Unionist sympathy in England, weakened Redmond and parliamentarism in Ireland and played directly into the hands of the Irish extremists.

The author views Redmond's famous speech at the outbreak of the war, in which he assured the government of the whole-hearted loyalty of Catholic Ireland, as the "supreme action" of his life. Yet Redmond

lived to see the spirit of his pledge repudiated by the rising tide of Sinn Féin and his vision of a united, self-governing, and happy Ireland shattered by British official blundering and Ulster *intransigence*. That was the tragedy of his life, and to the unfolding of it Mr. Gwynn devotes the greater part of his book. What he has written is an extended commentary on Redmond's words: "Some tragic fatality seems to dog the footsteps of this government in all their dealings with Ireland."

As a contribution to history Mr. Gwynn's last chapter, the Convention and the End, is the most valuable. The author was a member of the Irish Convention, and what he tells us of its proceedings carries the weight of first-hand authority. Of value from the same point of view are also parts of the chapter entitled the Raising of the Irish Brigades, which treat of matters of which the author—he was Captain Gwynn of the Sixteenth Irish Division—has intimate knowledge.

Mr. Gwynn displays some of the qualities which a biographer ought to possess. He knew Redmond intimately and admired him greatly, yet he makes no attempt to represent him as unerring in judgment and supreme in every quality of leadership. He is always temperate in language, never indulging in that partizan vituperation which mars so much of what has been written on the Irish question. He enjoyed the important advantage of access to Redmond's papers. Yet his book has serious defects from the point of view of both the serious student of Irish affairs and the general reader. The former will often not know what importance to attach to statements and interpretations, since authorities are as a rule not cited. The latter will too frequently find himself beyond his depth, unable to follow intelligently the discussion of subjects which are not explained.

*Handbooks prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office*, nos. 1-42. (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1920, pp. from 36 to 220 each, price 6d. to 5 sh. each.) The object of this series has been summed up as follows by Sir George Prothero, its general editor:

In the spring of 1917 the Foreign Office, in connexion with the preparation which they were making for the work of the Peace Conference, established a special section whose duty it should be to provide the British Delegates to the Peace Conference with information in the most convenient form—geographical, economic, historical, social, religious, and political—respecting the different countries, districts, islands, etc., with which they might have to deal. In addition, volumes were prepared on certain general subjects, mostly of an historical nature, concerning which it appeared that a special study would be useful. The historical information was compiled by trained writers on historical subjects, who (in most cases) gave their services without any remuneration. . . . The books are now published, with a few exceptions, substantially as they were issued for the use of the Delegates. No attempt has been made to bring them up to date.

The series is well done. We do not know just what was demanded of the editor or what latitude of control was allowed to him but we can see that his guiding hand has maintained a certain uniformity of treatment and moderation of tone. Polemics and propaganda are avoided. The historical portions are carefully made out and, as far as we have observed, their brief statements are seldom open to challenge. One can imagine that, for the overburdened statesman who had but half an hour to spare to get up an unfamiliar subject before he had to decide upon it in the Supreme Council, many of these tracts may have been most useful, more useful even, more up to date, and easier to carry about than would have been the corresponding articles in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. For the same reasons we can believe they will make acceptable works of reference in public libraries and newspaper offices.

On the other hand, the scholar, in looking over the series, will be less impressed, and even a cursory glance will suggest questions and criticisms. The need of some of the handbooks is not obvious, though the fact that we find pamphlets on such topics as "Holland" and "Spain" does not prove that British diplomacy harbored dark designs against either of these two friendly countries. The handbook on the history of the Eastern Question consists more than half of a documentary appendix. This may be right, yet one wonders if these treaties, etc., would not have been better placed in a general volume of such matter. One might multiply queries of this kind. To tell the truth, most of the handbooks are rather slight. So are many of their bibliographies, which, moreover, differ greatly among themselves in size and thoroughness. For instance, there are more than twice as many titles in the bibliography in No. 56 (Sakhalin) as in No. 55 (Eastern Siberia)—a vastly larger subject. The excellent handbook on the Åland Islands is a good example of condensed statement bringing out the most necessary points, but the brief bibliography hardly gains by the inclusion of three encyclopedias. Occasionally, too, comments are made as to the views of the authors given in the bibliographies. As this is done only occasionally, it is hardly fair. Why was it necessary to say, in connection with Professor Hazen's *Alsace-Lorraine under German Rule*, that "The writer is strongly French in sympathy"? He was not the only one. Finally, the series would be much more valuable to us if accompanied by the official maps prepared by the War Office, which are constantly referred to but which are not, as far as we know, offered to the public.

*The Story of the Great War.* By Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Professor of History, Washington University, St. Louis. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1919, pp. xvii, 350, \$2.50.) The author writes for the unformed of the adult population, and for children. He explains himself much in the simple way in which serious matter is "written down" for the young. He evidently feels very keenly the enormity of Germany's

sins against the rules of honorable war and wishes to make others feel it also. He rarely loses an opportunity to make the reader realize how much she hated, how much she coveted, and how ruthlessly she sought her ends. Many of the illustrations, taken from newspapers published in the most acute moments of the war, are full of extreme feeling. The book, therefore, does not tend to form cool and restrained views of the World War. Probably the author did not wish to form such views.

Its strong point is in its large amount of information presented clearly and directly. The chapters on the origin of the war contain much well-condensed information. The important campaigns are described with vividness. There is much about the methods, materials, and experiences of modern war, presented in an easy way. The campaigns of the American troops are described with more extensive treatment than a European writer would give them. We miss however an adequate account of the German efforts to influence American opinion, which might properly be kept before our people as a warning against similar efforts in the future. The reviewer has taken particular notice of some good black and white maps. To those who wish a vivid rather than a balanced "Story of the Great War" this book is commended.

*An Introduction to the Peace Treaties.* By Arthur Pearson Scott, Assistant Professor of History, University of Chicago. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. x, 292, \$2.00.) Mr. Scott's book is an excellent illustration of the value of perspective combined with careful study of documents, as opposed to the impressions of first-hand observation. At the moment when the market threatens to be flooded with dogmatic eye-witness accounts of the Peace Conference and its work, it is a relief to find an author disclaiming any "inside knowledge", and one who, possibly because of that fact, preserves a detached point of view, a sense of proportion, and a careful balance of judgment such as has not been conspicuous in much of the Peace Conference literature hitherto published. Mr. Scott's purpose is to summarize the conditions under which the treaties were made, and to state what the treaty provisions involve, with brief explanations thereof. It seems to the reviewer that he has succeeded admirably in a difficult task. Brief chapters on war aims and peace negotiations during the war are followed by a summary sketch of the Paris Conference and the framing of the treaties. The major portion of the book is devoted to an analysis of the Versailles Treaty, following its text closely but elucidating the issues at stake and the interests of the negotiating parties. The material effects of the various provisions are estimated and contradictory opinions summarized. The proposed settlements in southeastern Europe and Turkey are treated much more briefly in the same manner.

It is not to be expected that the book should be full of color, for the author rigorously excludes such questions as the Sixtus negotiations and does not permit himself the pleasure of personal characterization. Its



value is thereby in no way diminished. Minor errors are infrequent. Recent disclosures tend to mitigate the war-guilt of the Magyars, which the author, perhaps, over-emphasizes. Fiume with suburbs does not include a Slav majority. "Clémenceau" should be Clemenceau.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

*East by West, Essays in Transportation; a Commentary on the Political Framework within which the East India Trade has been carried on from very Early Times, starting with Babylon and ending very near Babylon.* By A. J. Morrison. (Boston, Four Seas Company, 1920, pp. 177, \$1.50.) In short chapters, sometimes of but two or three pages, the author sketches the striking characteristics of the political and commercial history of Oriental trade from the time of ancient Babylon to the present. The subtitle of the book, "Essays in Transportation", is quite misleading, for relatively little attention is given to that subject. The larger part of the little book is political history, in which as a framework the author sets the incidents of trade with the East. He deals almost altogether with particulars. Every page is sprinkled thickly with proper names. The author, in some introductory verse, acknowledges his obligation to the encyclopaedia, Smith's dictionaries, Grote, Finlay, Robertson, and Bancroft, and this list appears to characterize fairly his sources of information. The book was probably not designed and is certainly not adapted to fit the needs of a serious student, but may attract the casual reader by its rapid movement and informal style.

*Foreign Rights and Interests in China.* By Westel W. Willoughby, Professor of Political Science at the Johns Hopkins University, Legal Advisor to the Chinese Republic, 1916-1917. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1920, pp. xx, 594, \$7.50.) This is a very useful work for one who would know "the rights of foreigners and the interests of foreign States in China as they are to be found stated in treaties with or relating to China or in other documents of an official or quasi-official character". As a result of the interpretation of the most-favored-nation clause "in order to determine what treaty rights a particular nation has in China it is necessary to ascertain what privileges or immunities of a commercial or economic nature have been granted by China to any of the other Treaty Powers". So Professor Willoughby has brought together, in twenty chapters, the leading treaty stipulations on such subjects as extraterritoriality, foreign commerce, landholding, concessions and settlements, the open door, spheres of interest, China's foreign debts, and railway loans and foreign control. Six of the chapters deal with Japanese interests and ambitions in Manchuria, Shantung, and China in general.

As a work of reference the volume may be highly commended. For most purposes it needs little to supplement it. But as almost every chapter would require a volume in itself for a definitive discussion so

the careful student must still fall back upon the collections of treaties and upon such historical investigations as Morse's excellent three volumes on *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire*. But from 1912, where Morse ends his discussion, Dr. Willoughby treats the subject in more detail than in the preceding period.

As Dr. Willoughby points out, "the general observation may be made that in China, to a peculiar extent, there is a difference between the regulations and orders that are formulated by the Government and the results that are actually obtained under them". And a similar distinction must often be made between the text of treaty engagements and the actual operation of the articles. For these reasons there is a certain amount of unreality in most of the works on China which deal with the written word without a thorough examination of the actual conditions. Therefore the historian, while grateful to Professor Willoughby for the very helpful compilation which he has offered him, must feel that his own needs would have been served better if more attention had been paid to the origin of the early engagements which served as precedents for all that has followed. Dr. Willoughby has, on the other hand, confined his comments largely to recent happenings. Such statements as: "In 1884 (May 11) Annam was definitely lost by China to France. In 1885 and 1886 Indo-China was lost by her to France", indicate a rather sketchy knowledge of a very interesting precedent in the relations between China and her neighbors.

*The Columbian Tradition on the Discovery of America and on the Part played therein by the Astronomer Toscanelli: a Memoir addressed to the Professors Hermann Wagner of the University of Göttingen and Carlo Errera of Bologna.* By Henry Vignaud, President of the "Société des Américanistes". (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1920, pp. 62, 3 sh. 6 d.) Mr. Vignaud returns in this pamphlet to his well-buttressed theories concerning the purposes and plans of Christopher Columbus which he entertained before, during, and subsequent to his voyage of 1492. It is a memoir, he tells us, addressed to his distinguished critics and opponents Professors Hermann Wagner of Göttingen and Carlo Errera of Bologna, "who", he charges, "remain under the seductive charm of the fairy-tale that in 1492 the East was sought by way of the West". In the briefest possible manner he presents a summary of his own views concerning what he has chosen to call the "Columbian Tradition".

Mr. Vignaud, a veteran but vigorous historian of ninety years, well merits a place among those historical critics who dig deep into documents for first-hand information. He is fair to his opponents but very exacting of them. There can be no mistake as to his own position and the reason for his faith. He is much given to citing chapter and verse, and demands that his opponents shall do likewise; in other words he is much opposed to the loose speculation which has so long passed for reliable history concerning Columbus.

The problem of first importance in these traditions, as Mr. Vignaud sees it, is that having to do with the goal of the enterprise, and this leads him to give prominence to a restatement of his position, with a logic that is convincing, concerning the so-called Toscanelli documents. Here there is not involved, he thinks, the question of the authenticity of these documents—the letter and the map—seeing that their contents are foreign to the discovery of America, that is, to the purpose for which Columbus set out on his expedition, which was to find new islands or lands to the westward in the Atlantic, and not to sail to the East Indies by way of the West.

To the part taken by the son Ferdinand and the friend Las Casas in originating the "Columbian Tradition", and to the objects which doubtless were theirs in so doing, he gives careful and critical consideration. It was Las Casas himself who placed the prefatory letter at the beginning of the so-called Columbus Journal, stating that the sovereigns had enjoined him to go to the Indies, but to Las Casas "Las Indias" clearly meant the West Indies, as witness for example the title of his work *Historia de las Indias* treating of the discovery and conquest of the New World.

Mr. Vignaud cannot be accused of an attempt to lessen the fame of Columbus; on the contrary he contends, as before indicated, that Columbus had discovered the very lands which he had gone out to seek. Through his studies, his meditations, and his constant inquiries, he had "divined" the existence of America, and such a Columbus is more worthy of reverence and honor than the traditional Columbus trying to penetrate the East by way of the West.

E. L. STEVENSON.

*Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1715-1717.* (Boston, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1919, pp. x, 291.)

It is an omen of promise for the future that the Massachusetts Historical Society has begun to issue in its series of publications the journals of the House of Representatives of the province of Massachusetts Bay, a matter that ought long ago to have been attended to by the state itself. The first volume to appear covers the years 1715-1717, and is handsomely printed and bound in the characteristic style adopted by the society. As we understand the plan, the society is to print eventually both assembly and council minutes and the state is to aid the enterprise by taking five hundred copies of each issue, thus indirectly contributing about \$1200 to the cost of publication, the original cost having been met from the Dowse fund. This combination of state and society is much to be commended, as it assures good editing, a service that is not always satisfactory when the state fathers the enterprise alone. Satisfaction with the plan loses, however, some of its edge when we discover that the society is doing no more than reprint the printed journals, which begin with 1715, thus not only ignoring the earlier manuscript journals,

which go back to 1692, but failing also to collate the printed text with the original manuscript. The course followed is the easier of the two, for printers can set up from photostat copies, thus saving an editor much trouble and a society much expense. We presume, however, that Mr. Ford and the society have faced the larger problem and will in time give us the entire series of minutes from 1692 to the close of the colonial period, thus reproducing both manuscript and printed texts. No statement to that effect is made in the introduction and the matter is rendered uncertain by the numbering "Volume I.", which appears on the half-title page and in the binder's title; but to do otherwise would be to deprive the undertaking of much of its usefulness.

*American Foreign Policy, based upon Statements of Presidents and Secretaries of State of the United States and Publicists of the American Republics*, with an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. (Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1920, pp. vii, 128.) This collection of documents is intended by the editor to comprise "those official statements by successive Presidents and Secretaries of State which, having been formally or tacitly accepted by the American people, do in effect constitute the foundation of American foreign policy. . . . They are the classic declarations of policy which, taken together, present a record of which the American people may well be proud". Naturally the selection begins with Washington's Farewell Address and includes Jefferson's statement as to entangling alliances. Then follow the various messages relating to the Monroe Doctrine: Monroe's, Polk's, Buchanan's, Grant's, Cleveland's, and Roosevelt's. Blaine, Hay, and Root contribute their ideas as to the Monroe Doctrine, that of the last named being in no sense official, as it is the well-known address as president of the American Society of International Law for 1914. The instructions to and reports from the American delegates to the Hague conferences are properly included. The Recommendations of Havana concerning international organization, and the commentary thereon by Dr. James Brown Scott, however, are in no sense the official expression of any policy of the United States. Reprinting them in this form strengthens the impression that this book is one of *tendenz* character. They are

now offered to the peoples of Europe and Asia as America's positive contribution to the solution of the problem of providing a form of international co-operation which will avoid the creation of a super-government and rest international co-operation upon respect and reverence for law. This is the path of progress to which the traditions of American foreign policy point and this is the path upon which the Government of the United States may well invite other nations speedily to enter.

Therefore, we are not surprised to find nothing in the volume emanating from President Wilson. Instead appears the rider to the Naval Appropriation Bill of 1916, which declared for disarmament and authorized

the President at the close of the war to invite all the great governments of the world to a conference for the consideration of a plan for a world court. The authorization still stands, and an appropriation of \$200,000 for the purpose is as yet unexpended. The various selections, therefore, ought to provide a convenient aid to those who desire to expound the planks of the Republican platform bearing upon the League of Nations.

J. S. R.

*The Čechs (Bohemians) in America: a Study of their National, Cultural, Political, Social, Economic, and Religious Life.* By Thomas Čapek. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920, pp. xix, 294, \$3.00.) Very few of us who have heard our grandmothers play that ancient companion to "The Maiden's Prayer", "The Battle of Prague", realize that it was an actual event, and one which was primarily responsible for the Czech (or Bohemian) element in the United States. In the seventeenth-century struggle between Catholic and Protestant which ended in the dispersal of the Protestant Czechs into all lands but their own began the first wave of Czech settlement in America. The Hussites, Thomas Čapek tells us in his comprehensive book, *The Čechs in America*, driven from their own land, sought homes not only in nearby Saxony and Hungary and Silesia, but the bolder spirits came to the new country.

*The Čechs in America* is a comprehensive, carefully arranged manual of all information about this section of our immigration, a section more important than we had heretofore realized. From the earliest Bohemians who fled here from religious persecution in the seventeenth century, to the latest flood of immigration, which, like all other immigration of our days, has industrial reasons behind it, he omits nothing.

He brings to our attention valuable qualities of the Czech, or, as it is easier to remember him, the Bohemian; the idealism, the persistence, the self-reliance, the intelligence, which he contributes to our commonwealth. It must be something of a shock to those of us who know the Czech mainly as the "Bohunk" of our industrial centres, to face the fact that Ellis Island records show him lowest in percentage of illiterates, and highest in percentage of skilled labor.

With the industry which he commends in his fellow-citizens, Mr. Čapek has dug from our records the surprising fact that the founder of the Philipse family, of the old manor of that name, as well as men who were grantees under Lord Baltimore, and wealthy merchants in Dutch New York, were Czechs. So were some of those Moravians whose settlement in Pennsylvania is still a factor in our land.

After the Moravian settlement in the eighteenth century, immigration, discouraged by the authorities of the mother country, practically ceased until 1840, when famine sent a new wave of the Bohemians to our shores. The revolution of 1848 added more; since then the immigration, steadily increasing and focusing in the Middle West, has been of the

peasant classes, agriculturalists and mechanics at first, but in the second generation taking, through the work of the public schools and high schools, the inevitable step upward into the office-working classes.

Mr. Capek covers thoroughly and by name the Czech leaders in trades, professions, religious thought, literature, and the arts. To anyone wishing, or needing, as in this day many need and wish, to be authoritatively and thoroughly informed on this subject, his book is indispensable.

There are many illustrations, an appendix giving a partial bibliography, and an index.

*The Constitutional History of the Louisiana Purchase, 1803-1812.* By Everett Somerville Brown, Ph.D. [University of California Publications in History, vol. X.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1920, pp. xi, 248, \$2.50.) Dr. Brown's monograph contributes little that is new to the subjects which it treats; but he is to be thanked for placing between two covers so thorough and painstaking a history of the constitutional problems created by the Louisiana purchase. Of the several aspects of that event—diplomatic, territorial, economic, constitutional—the last has hitherto received the least attention from historians. Yet the Louisiana Purchase was the first elastic test of the federal constitution, and the first acid test of Jefferson's sincerity in strict construction. William Plumer's account of the Senate debate on the Breckenridge bill for the government of Louisiana, from the Plumer MSS. at the Library of Congress, which Dr. Brown contributed to the *American Historical Review* (XXII. 340-364), is here reprinted as an appendix and made the basis of an excellent chapter. Other chapters analyze contemporary opinion of the status of Louisiana, the debate on the treaty, Louisiana's successful efforts to obtain a modification of the first territorial government, the constitutional questions created by East Florida's "self-determination" in 1810, and the question of admitting Louisiana to the Union. Dr. Brown has covered a wide range of manuscript and printed material, and handled it with a just sense of proportion and a keen scent for the significant. These qualities are, perhaps, all one has right to expect in a doctoral dissertation. I do wish, however, that aspirants for the three magic letters would not be so oppressed by the solemnity of their quest as to neglect the light and humorous aspects of their subject. In this case, Jefferson's constitutional qualms on the treaty, so provocative of Homeric laughter when handled by a Henry Adams or a Beveridge, become merely the dry bones of a discussion.

S. E. MORISON.

*The Rise of Methodism in the West, being the Journal of the Western Conference, 1800-1811.* Edited, with Notes and Introduction, by William Warren Sweet, Professor of History, DePauw University. (New York and Cincinnati, Methodist Book Concern, 1920, pp. 207, \$1.25.)

One of the most striking evidences of present-day interest in religious history is the publication from time to time of manuscript records not easily accessible to the investigator. For the Methodist denomination Professor Sweet has already rendered important services, particularly in his volume entitled *Circuit Rider Days in Indiana*, which contains the journal of the Indiana Conference from 1832 to 1844. This more recent book although less impressive in size contains a no-less important document, the journal of the Western Conference from 1800, when the more inclusive designation was substituted for that of the Kentucky Conference, which it had hitherto borne, until 1811, the last meeting before the division of the conference. The interval of twenty years between these two records, it is to be hoped, will some day be covered by the publication of the journal of the Ohio and Tennessee conference under the same competent editorship.

As in the *Circuit Rider Days in Indiana*, this volume contains several introductory chapters dealing with the early history of Western Methodism. The value of these is unequal. The first two give a brief and authoritative narrative of Methodist expansion from 1782 to 1811, based upon manuscript and printed sources with which the author is so thoroughly familiar. In the third and fourth chapters there is much repetition, many of the incidents having already been related in exactly the same phraseology in the introduction to the previous volume, while the same passage from Cartwright's *Autobiography* is cited in chapters two and four of this introduction. Written avowedly from the sectarian point of view and with evident sectarian pride, these chapters nevertheless bear the impress of the fairminded and critical historian. The writing of sectarian history in the light of new information is undoubtedly of value, but as a picture of Western religious life a book of this kind does not fall in the same class with comparative studies such as Miss Cleveland's volume on the *Great Revival in the West in 1800*.

The lack of an index, which is one of the most frequent hindrances to research in religious history, is much to be regretted in so well-edited a publication.

*Catholic Beginnings in Kansas City, Missouri: an Historical Sketch.* By Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. (Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1920, pp. 137, \$1.25.) Old cities, like old people, delight in reminiscences. We should not be surprised, therefore, that Kansas City, which has long since passed the Biblical ten and threescore, likes to cast a glance back on the days of her youth. That the history of her early life arrested the attention of Father G. J. Garraghan is a privilege she cannot overestimate; well may she be proud of the monument he has raised in memory of her pioneer days. Deliberately he has limited his scope to the "Catholic Beginnings", and throughout he scrupulously remains true to his purpose: his book will have to be reckoned with when the time comes to compile a complete History of Catholicity in the United



States; at the same time, religious and civil history are naturally so closely interwoven that no treatment of the development of the Middle West can now afford to ignore Father Garraghan's work.

Westport Landing, the future Kansas City, started, like most early settlements of the Mississippi Valley, as a trading post on the Indian frontier; its first name, Chouteau, indicates sufficiently its St. Louisan affiliation; and there, like everywhere else, Catholic religion went hand in hand with pioneering. Whether it was at the mouth of the Kansas, or at quite a distance east of that place, that Father de Lacroix met the great Kansas chief White-Plume, is not clear; at all events, less than seven years after the establishment of the Chouteau post, Father J. A. Lutz visited the place and the Indian neighboring tribes (1828). Five years later Father Benedict Roux was sent by Bishop Rosati to resume the work. To the efforts and labors of this courageous and zealous priest the author quite deservedly devotes no less than fifty out of the one hundred and thirty-odd pages of his volume. His narrative then follows the work of the early Missouri Jesuits: Van Quickenborne, Hoecken, Aelen, and Point, down to the time of the coming to Kansas City of Father Bernard Donnelly. It is, then, a period of a little more than twenty-five years that the author covers in his book, of which he had, two years ago, given an earnest by the publication of several of Father Roux's letters. This correspondence, the reports of the Jesuit missionaries, and other papers stored up in the diocesan archives of St. Louis form the bulk of manuscript sources, mostly unpublished, which the writer, who is a trained historian, has wisely exploited and artfully woven into a well-planned and most charmingly written narrative. He very seldom nods. He did so, however (p. 22), apropos of the dates of Bishop Du Bourg's residence in St. Louis: the good prelate left Missouri, not in 1821, but some two months before. Page 74, Roux's Latin quotation must be *corde et animo*. The volume, very neatly printed and tastefully illustrated, reflects much credit upon the Loyola University Press.

C. L. SOUVAY.

*The Paths of Inland Commerce; a Chronicle of Trail, Road, and Waterway.* By Archer B. Hulbert. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XXI.] (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1920, pp. xii, 211.) Professor Hulbert is well equipped for writing the story of the early development of the transportation routes of the United States, for he has already published sixteen volumes on the pioneer roads and canals, based upon personal observation and first-hand study. A more careful later volume on *Washington and the West* traversed some of the same ground in more thorough fashion. In the monograph under review the author has brought together the best results of his earlier labors and woven them into a connected and well-written

AM HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—10.

narrative of the part which trails, roads, canals, and natural waterways have played in our commercial development.

The interest of the author in his subject has at times betrayed him into extreme forms of statement, but on the whole he has maintained a fair balance. The statement that "every problem in the building of the Republic has been, in the last analysis, a problem in transportation" (p. vii), is a thesis which even he would probably be willing to modify in spite of the great importance of this factor. So, too, the wish to construct full, well-rounded periods has at times led to exaggeration, as in such phrases as "the great industries of the West" in 1800 (p. 69), "innumerable tons of flour, tobacco, and bacon" (p. 70), "the overflowing wealth of the [national] treasury" from 1811 to 1815 (p. 114), "fields without number" (p. 172), "no one can exaggerate the importance of this waterway [the Illinois and Michigan Canal] between 1848 and 1860" (p. 163). The importance of the Ohio canals, on the other hand, seems to be rather underestimated. It is, moreover, doubtful whether the Indians ever fared abroad "to trade" (p. 15). While inclined to emphasize the geographic factors, Professor Hulbert has also made due allowance for the economic factors and the individual contributions of inventors and men of action in determining and developing the routes of our early commerce.

E. L. BOGART.

*The New South: a Chronicle of Social and Industrial Evolution.* By Holland Thompson. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XLII.] (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1919, pp. ix, 250.) This small volume on a large subject has two notable characteristics. One is its catholicity of spirit. The author nowhere defines the "New South"; on the other hand he points out the variety of political opinion and of economic interests that have arisen since 1876. At no point is he defensive or denunciatory, nor does he take pains to indicate phenomena that are isolated or exceptional. The impression left is that the term "New South" simply embraces an ever-widening variety of political and economic life. The other characteristic of the book is its descriptive value. Only the first three chapters, which trace political movements from the close of Reconstruction through the Populist movement, can be considered strictly historical, and these are interpretative rather than narrative. The remaining chapters discuss from the angle of an observer the development of agriculture and industry, labor conditions, the race problem, educational progress, and current social tendencies. In them the author manifests the insight and sane judgment so notable in his previous volume *From Cotton Field to Cotton Mill*, a study of the transition in North Carolina, and in the present volume most of his illustrations of general movements are taken from that state.

The principal limitations of the book proceed from the necessity of

condensation. Consequently some important matters are omitted, notably the reclaiming of poor and waste lands in recent years. The rise of state control over railroads and large corporations, the changes in tax systems, and the development of state administration are not touched, nor the conditions which gave rise to the early primary laws. That the origins of industrialism were vitally related to the humble rôle of the region in national politics, and in many instances to a quasi-humanitarian spirit on the part of the capitalists, is nowhere suggested. Yet as a brief and suggestive survey of the rise of a civilization the book is unsurpassed. Unfortunately the bibliography is very brief and does not include the titles of many serial publications, monographs, and general works of a helpful nature.

WILLIAM K. BOYD.

*The Agrarian Crusade: a Chronicle of the Farmer in Politics.* By Solon J. Buck. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XLV.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1920, pp. xi, 215.) While it is undoubtedly a phase of American history which should not be overlooked, to take the subject of the "farmer in politics" out of the general mass of material bearing upon the course of the country since the Civil War and make it the subject of a separate treatise cannot yield very noteworthy results. For a title the editor has chosen "The Agrarian Crusade," which covers the Granger, the Greenback, the Farmers' Alliance, and the Populist movements. Every one of them was based on class selfishness and flourished amid poverty and ignorance. The eccentric fandangoes which the leaders of the movements cut in a number of state and national campaigns are things the farmer of this day, one of the wealthiest and solidest figures in our citizenry, would like to forget. Fortunately such fatuities never did possess the minds or beguile the steps of any considerable number of the cultivators of our soil and the gleaners of our harvests. The farmers who sat at Horace Greeley's feet as they read the *Weekly Tribune* had their "isms", but praise be, they did not contribute the men who strode into our politics to be remembered because of their want of socks, their long beards, their speeches about pitchforks, bloody bridles, and crosses of gold.

A reading of Mr. Buck's altogether temperate little essay about these personages leads one to marvel at his patience in dealing with them and their antics. His account of how the Grange was formed by some government clerks in Washington during Andrew Johnson's administration, and how it, after a good while, grew, is valuable. The "Greenbacker" business might have been amplified. While this particular lunacy was not solely for the farmer, it was set before the country, by such as Ben Butler and George Pendleton, to get their votes. Leaders would mislead them into being repudiators and inflationists by the use of paper money at this time just as they were besought to espouse the silver cause at a later period. Nowhere in it is to be found anything which is to the

credit of our American farmer except in the case in which he withstood such priests and apostles, and this, often and generally, except on the advancing frontier of Western settlement, he did.

Mr. Buck finds a little that is good to say for his "agrarian" movement. The Grange, with its local branches, being open to men and women together, added something to the joy of living in many communities. Men were raised up out of their sordid surroundings, their wives lost some of the hopelessness into which they sank at drear tasks in their isolated homes. They also were taught the reading habit. They began to subscribe for propaganda and class papers. In union they gained a sense of power which, if it was not always used wisely, was uplifting. They also developed a desire for more laws, more government. *Laissez-faire* was to be replaced by a policy which would set the state at work to improve the common lot. Out of it all, Mr. Buck thinks, came the recent "progressive" movement—the "Progressive Party" of 1912, which "vanished from the stage" in 1916, only "when both the old parties were believed to have become progressive".

ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER.

*The Budget and Responsible Government.* By Frederick A. Cleveland and Arthur Eugene Buck. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1920, pp. xxxiii, 406.) While this volume in no full sense belongs to the field of history, the authors have entitled part I. of their work Historical Background and Interpretation of the Recent Movement for Administrative Reorganization and Budget Procedure (pp. 3-129). In these pages, however, "interpretation" bulks far larger than historical matter, which is largely introduced as illustrative material. Quotations from the words of Wilson, Hughes, Roosevelt, Taft, and Root are used by the authors to support their contention that our government has lost its responsiveness to the popular will, that we have accepted the idea of the control of the many by the few. The development of this lack of responsiveness—our government through standing committees, our irresponsible party machines and political bosses—can scarcely be said to be placed in historical perspective though historical allusions are frequent. The effort to cure this basic evil in our administrative machinery is drawn in outline, but for a thorough knowledge of the growth of the movement the reader must look elsewhere. For an understanding of its significance and its relation to present problems he will find help here.

*A History of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.* By Howard Douglas Dozier, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Dartmouth College. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920, pp. xv, 197, \$2.00.) The main theme of this monograph is the construction and linking up of the numerous railroads running near the seacoast from above Richmond to below Savannah. Illuminating treatment is given to the

launching of the early lines, to the handicap of steamship competition so long as their tracks were unconnected, and to the prosperity rewarding the improvements and economies consequent upon the consolidation. The brief discussions of early traffic and rate problems and of the organization of the Atlantic Coast Despatch for the carriage of perishable freight are particularly interesting.

The consolidation of the Atlantic Coast Line system was a remarkably intelligent piece of work. The book, however, fails to tell whose conception it was; and neither the index nor apparently the text contains the name of Henry Walters. The later chapters, in fact, are notably lacking in the mention of personnel. Other faults lie in the construction of sentences and paragraphs, in the omission of dates of publication from the bibliography, and in occasional errors of statement. On page 69, for example, is a misleading paraphrase from Mills's *Statistics of South Carolina*. Mills merely says, "Tobacco and indigo have each been staples of Carolina", and this is quite true. Dozier says, "Tobacco and indigo had each in turn been the staple of the state in early times", which is not true; for neither of these was ever the staple of South Carolina, and in their sequence there as minor staples tobacco did not precede indigo. Finally, it is regrettable that although the preface is dated 1920, the statistical tables end with 1915 or 1916, and near the end of the text it is intimated that the year 1907 falls within the "last decade". The book, nevertheless, is in general a substantial and well-considered contribution.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

*Talks with T. R.: from the Diaries of John J. Leary, Jr.* (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920, pp. xiv, 334, \$3.50.) It is Roosevelt the tribal chieftain that is revealed in this book, loving his friends and being served by them with devotion, hating his enemies and wishing that life were long enough for them all to be punished. It is the bitter leader of the opposition in the closing years of his life, with the party he hated in power and a leader whom he openly despised in office. The picture is less attractive than that of the writer of the letters to his children, or of the state papers that have been included in Mr. Bishop's selection, but it seems to present with fidelity one of the poses of the most versatile statesman of our day.

The compiler, Mr. Leary, is one of the group of newspaper men who surrounded Roosevelt in his later life. He tells of the difficulties of the anti-Roosevelt papers in keeping their writers loyal to editorial policy because of the spell that Roosevelt cast over nearly everyone who entered his circle. The "newspaper cabinet" was invariably treated with confidence and advised of matters that were not yet ready for the public. Mr. Leary kept private notes of these informal conversations and now presents them for a period of about four years. There is no utterance that has been noted earlier than 1916; most of them have to do with the

war and its various aspects, and through the whole collection run the consistent themes of Americanism and contempt for Wilson.

Few new facts are given to the world, but there are many expressions of opinion that will enliven sober histories in the future. Those who wondered how and why Roosevelt supported Hughes in 1916 will note with interest that in moments of depression the Colonel called his candidate the "bearded lady" (p. 52). The attack upon Wilson for his appeal for votes in 1918 appears in a new light when it is revealed that Roosevelt prepared and suppressed a similar statement asking for republican votes, suppressing it only "on the ground that it left the way open to attack" (p. 330). The absence of an index makes the book more difficult to use than it need have been.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*The Monroe Doctrine and the Great War.* By Arnold Bennett Hall, J.D., Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin. (Chicago, A. C. McClurg and Company, 1920, pp. xiii, 177, 75 cents.) This small volume professedly makes a popular appeal. In seven chapters the author sets forth the foundations, the formulation, and the various "enunciations" of the Doctrine. The narrative is generally clear and in most respects quite conventional. Mr. Ford's classic exposition of the authorship of the Doctrine could have been used to advantage. Like nearly every one who has written upon this subject during the past twenty-five years, the author finds the so-called "Secret Treaty of Verona of 1822" an important basis for Monroe's pronouncement. The text of this document, reprinted by the late Professor Freeman Snow in his *Treaties and Topics in American Diplomacy* from Elliot's *Diplomatic Code*, is unquestionably spurious. Doubts were cast upon it at least as long ago as 1855 by Schaumann in von Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch* for that year. The author regards Washington's Farewell Address as essentially one of the foundations of the Doctrine, yet he claims that while the Monroe Doctrine is alive and vigorous, the policy of Washington, summed up as one of isolation, is obsolete because based upon a transitory situation. It might be insisted that the original Monroe Doctrine comes nearer this description, for the "reputed designs of the Holy Alliance" were, if they ever existed, abandoned by the time Monroe sent in his message, and the so-called non-colonization principle of Adams was set forth as a plain statement of fact. The reader might desire proof of the statement that Jefferson meant only secret alliances by those that were "entangling", and he might well challenge the assertion that the "old alliances were formed for the purpose of waging war".

The justification for the title of the present work lies in a single chapter which is a résumé of several of the arguments in favor of the League of Nations with which the average reader has by this time become fairly familiar. Of these Professor Hall is an enthusiastic advo-

cate: the League "is an effort to found a constructive peace policy upon the realities of today as distinguished from the ostrich-like naïveté of those who seek to base great national policies upon effete theories of isolation which are negated by the most obvious facts of modern life" (p. 142). Finally, in the League or out of it, the Monroe Doctrine of the future, as of the past, will, he thinks, "be a policy of self-defense" to the United States.

J. S. R.

*Official History of 82nd Division American Expeditionary Forces, "All American" Division, 1917-1919.* Written by Divisional Officers designated by the Division Commander. (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1919, pp. vii, 310, \$1.75.) In the winter following the armistice while the Eighty-Second Division was awaiting transport home, Major (afterwards Lieutenant-Colonel) G. Edward Buxton, jr., was detailed to prepare its history. Brother officers lent all possible assistance by conference and by excursions with him over the main battle area and by reading and approving his manuscript. On his own part, the author shows high competence and complete freedom from vainglory. It follows that in tone and substance the book is just what such a book should be.

The composition and career of this National Army Division, which properly styled itself the "All American", was remarkably typical of America's participation. After six months of training at Camp Gordon, near Atlanta, Ga., it reached France in May, 1918, when its aid seemed likely to be needed in the defense of the Channel ports and it took training station behind the British front. In June, however, it moved for front-line experience to the fairly quiet Lagny sector near Toul. In August it was shifted to the neighborhood of Pont-à-Mousson, where in September it formed the southern pivot of the St. Mihiel drive.

All this, though it comprised some sharp fighting, proved to be but practice-work. It was in the middle stage of the Meuse-Argonne offensive, October 6-21, that the division met its destiny. The vivid tale of these tremendous days on the western edge and at the northern end of the Argonne Forest fills the greater part of the book. Here are in detail, heavily documented from the division's records, all the characteristic episodes of open warfare: the night approach in driving rain through (not over) improvised and congested roads across the shell-torn recent battle-grounds; the day-break jump-off; the charge up and over wooded heights; the flanking of machine-gun nests, Corporal York's famous exploit being of course set forth especially; the rolling barrage and controversy over its proper rate of advance; *liaison* and the lack thereof resulting in the inevitable "fog of war"; the attempt to establish a bridge-head; the advance from forest into open country where the Kriemhilde-Stellung must be penetrated; exposed flanks and untenable salients; barbed wire, phosgene, fox-holes, and pill-boxes;



friendly tanks which never came, and hostile airplanes which brought machine-guns in full action; complaints to the divisional artillery that its shells were bursting in its own infantry's ranks, and proof that the charge was untrue; rain, mist, and mud; illness, casualties, and exhaustion; and finally, when power to advance had been utterly spent, the holding of a salient for ten days by battalions decimated well nigh to platoon dimensions, until at the end of the month relief and replacements eventually came.

It is perhaps because the general theme is one of success that the most impressive chapters are those telling of adversity. One of these relates the efforts of a battalion of the 326th Infantry to get a bridge-head across the Aire River north of Marcq. A persistent search by night failed to find a ford, but when troops in process of crossing on a makeshift foot-bridge were fired upon and jumped into the river they discovered a ford unawares. When this was utilized for the advance, however, such a storm of machine-gun fire was met that the survivors had to retreat as they best might; and this particular bridge-head, apparently, was never established. Other such chapters tell of the making and abandonment of an untenable salient in the Kriemhilde-Stellung by the 325th Infantry, and of the grim holding of the line by the attenuated and exhausted units.

Supplementary chapters from other pens than Colonel Buxton's relate, among other things, the history of the division after the armistice and the experience of its artillery, engineer, medical, and signal units.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

*The Government of the United States, National, State and Local.* By William Bennett Munro, Professor of Municipal Government in Harvard University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1919, pp. x, 648, \$2.75.) The introductory collegiate course in government has become well-nigh standardized throughout the country. It had its origin, somewhat over a decade ago, in a realistic revolt against the attempt to initiate underclassmen into the art of government through discussions of sovereignty and of the classifications of states. It proposed to begin with facts and with the facts at home; it became essentially a description of the governmental mechanism of the United States. Professor Munro does not break with this norm.

This essential conformity is illustrated in the use of history. Professor Munro informs us in his preface that it is his purpose "not only to explain the form and functions of the American political system, but to indicate the origin and purpose of the various institutions" (p. vii). In his opening chapter on English and colonial origins he emphasizes our indebtedness to colonial institutions. But these, he as quickly points out, were relatively matured; below them was "the heritage of the whole Anglo-Saxon Race". The story of the development of that heritage necessarily goes untold. The consequence is that the underlying ele-

ments of our governmental system remain quite unexplained genetically. Although this text contains rather more of running historical explanation than its predecessors, one might be inclined to quarrel with a method of approach which attempts an inclusive and detailed description of structure, as contrasted with a method which, concentrating on fewer and relatively more fundamental phases of government, could put them against a background far-reaching enough really to explain their evolution through the centuries.

But texts need not chart the courses themselves. Professor Munro's book, for example, draws only occasional and limited comparisons with the institutions and practices of other countries, these being pointed mainly at the English constitutional system. Yet the reviewer understands that nearly half of the introductory course at Harvard, of which Professor Munro declares (p. vii) his text to be a by-product, has been given to a survey of certain European governments, while lectures which have not hesitated to wander far afield have contributed elements of synthesis and interpretation.

Regardless of the turn which the introductory collegiate course in government may take in the future, we shall continue to need descriptive texts along traditional lines.

*Las Veladas Literarias del Virrey del Perú Marqués de Casteldosrius, 1709-1710.* Por José Revello de Torre. [Publicaciones del Centro Oficial de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla, Cuaderno IV.] (Seville, Tip. Zarzuela, 1920, pp. 20.) The author of this monograph has based his work on documentary sources found in the National Library of Madrid and in the General Archive of the Indies at Seville. Sr. Torres, an Argentine, has been for a year or more at work in Seville; he had visited other archives in Spain before he settled down in that of the Indies, to make the extensive investigations into sources for Argentine history in which he is now engaged.

His monograph is interesting. Among the political and military documents which fill the Spanish archives there is comparatively little bearing upon either economic or social questions; therefore the picture which Sr. Torres presents, of the literary salons over which the Marqués de Casteldosrius presided, is refreshing because it is unusual and also because it is beautiful. The monograph brings before the reader brilliant scenes—in the viceroy's "crystal gallery", where assembled an aristocratic and talented company, the gallants of which were competent to strike an attitude before a new chandelier and make it an excuse to sing the marquis's praises in ten-foot verse!

I. A. WRIGHT.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association will take place in Washington on December 28, 29, and 30. Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University is chairman of the programme committee, Dr. Thomas Nelson Page is chairman of the committee of local arrangements, and Dr. H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, is its secretary. Sessions will begin on the morning of the 28th, but the presidential address of Professor Edward Channing will be given that evening, together with that of Dr. Paul S. Reinsch, president of the American Political Science Association, the latter organization meeting at the same place and dates. A joint session of the two societies, with papers relating chiefly to foreign politics, especially relations with Hispanic America, is expected. There will also be a joint conference with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and with the Agricultural History Society, and a meeting of the conference of historical societies. Ancient and medieval history, modern European history, American history, and the history of science will be the themes of individual conferences. There will be a special "luncheon conference" at the Library of Congress on the opportunities for historical research in the city of Washington, and conferences, at luncheons or dinners, of those specially interested in economic history, in the history of the Far East, in the history of Latin America, and the like. A subscription dinner, with attractive speakers, is planned as one of the chief social events. The headquarters will be at the New Willard Hotel.

### PERSONAL

Professor Franklin B. Dexter of Yale University died in New Haven on August 13, at the age of seventy-seven. He was for eleven years professor of American history in Yale University, and for forty-three years assistant librarian. His largest publications concerned his university, and included six volumes of *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Yale College, 1701-1815*, a *Documentary History* of the university, *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles*, and his *Itineraries and Correspondence*. He also edited the earlier volumes of the *New Haven Town Records*. Extensive and minute as was his knowledge of Connecticut history, he was far from being a mere antiquarian, but wrote of New England antiquities with a large comprehension of general history. He was a man of great benevolence and personal charm.

August Fournier, professor of history in the University of Vienna, died in May at the age of sixty years. He is chiefly known for his ex-

cellent biography of *Napoleon I.* and for other works on the same period.

Professor Allen M. Kline, hitherto dean and professor of history and political science in the University of the Pacific, has been made professor of history in Middlebury College.

It was by error that we stated in our July number, p. 758, that Professor Kent R. Greenfield of Delaware College had been appointed professor of history in Yale University; the appointment was to the position of assistant professor.

Professor Christopher B. Coleman of Butler College, Indianapolis, has been elected professor of history in Allegheny College, at Meadville, Pa., and has begun work there this autumn.

Dr. Arthur C. Cole, of the University of Illinois, has become a professor in Ohio State University. Dr. George A. Wood has been made assistant professor of American history in the same institution.

In Indiana University, Assistant Professor William T. Morgan has been promoted to be associate professor of European history. Associate Professor Kohlmeier will be on leave of absence during 1920-1921. His place will be filled for the year by Professor William O. Lynch of the Indiana State Normal School.

Dr. Marcus W. Jernegan has lately been given the full rank of a professor of history in the University of Chicago.

Dr. James G. Randall has been appointed associate professor, Dr. F. C. Dietz, of Smith College, and Dr. Theodore C. Pease have been appointed assistant professors, of history in the University of Illinois. The latter has been charged with the editing of the *Collections* of the Illinois State Historical Library, in succession to Professor C. W. Alvord.

Dr. Carl Stephenson of Washington University is to be assistant professor of history in the University of Wisconsin during the coming year. Miss Martha L. Edwards, formerly of Lake Erie College, has been made assistant professor of history in the University of Wisconsin, in charge of correspondence study in that field.

Mr. Theodore C. Blegen has been appointed assistant professor of history and economics in Hamline University.

Professor R. G. Usher of Washington University has been granted a year's leave of absence from that institution, during which time Professor T. M. Marshall, formerly of the University of Colorado, now professor in Washington University, will act as head of the department. Professor E. M. Violette, of the State Normal School, at Kirksville, Mo., will serve as acting professor of history at that university during Professor Usher's absence.

Dr. Chauncey S. Boucher has resigned from the faculty of Ohio State University and accepted a position as professor of American history in the University of Texas.

Dr. Clarence Perkins, of Ohio State University, has been made professor and head of the department of European history in the University of North Dakota.

Dr. Alfred H. Sweet, hitherto acting assistant professor of English history in Cornell University, has been elected assistant professor of history in the University of Colorado; for the present year, in the absence of Professor James F. Willard, he will be chiefly occupied with continuing Dr. Willard's work.

Professor Frank A. Golder, of Washington State College, who during the summer session has been teaching in Stanford University, sailed for Europe in September on a commission from that university in the interest of the Hoover War History Collection.

Professor K. C. Leebrick has resigned from the University of California to accept the position of head of the department of history and political science in the University of Hawaii. During the present semester Professor E. D. Adams of Stanford is giving a series of lectures on nineteenth-century history at the former university.

#### GENERAL

General review: R. Basset, *Bulletin des Périodiques de l'Islam*, 1914-1918 (Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, November).

Viscount Rothermere has given an endowment of £20,000 to the University of Oxford for the support of a professorship of American history to bear the name of his son, Captain Harold Harmsworth, who was killed in the war while an Oxford undergraduate. It is one of the conditions of the endowment that the occupant of the chair shall be a citizen of the United States.

Under the editorial charge of Professor Hermann Oncken of Heidelberg, and the fostering care of the publishers Perthes of Gotha, the *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte*, founded in 1822 and conducted successively by Heeren and Ukert, Giesebrecht, and Lamprecht, takes a new lease of life despite the discouragements of the last few years, and plans many valuable historical volumes for the service of the new Germany. Several of these volumes are already in type, or finished in manuscript. We note the following, of which at least the first volumes are to be expected before long: a history of Prussia in the nineteenth century (3 vols.), by Professor Felix Rachfahl; for Bavaria, a continuation of Riezler, from 1726 to 1871 (3 vols.), by Professor Karl Alexander von Müller; for Austria, a continuation of Huber, from 1648 to 1705 (first volume), by Oswald Redlich; a first volume for Styria (to 1282), by Professor Karl Pirchegger; for Carinthia, a first volume by Jaksch von Wartenhorst; for Hamburg, two volumes (1815-1914) by Dr. Ernst Baasch; for Bohemia, a volume running from 1526 to 1576, by Bertold Bretholz; for Hungary, five volumes, by Alexander Domanovszky and

David Angyal; for Switzerland (1848-1914), a continuation of the late Johannes Dierauer's work, by Professor Hans Schneider of Zurich; for the Netherlands, a seventh volume (1795-1839) of the German translation of Blok; two volumes on Norway, by Professor Halvdan Koht of Christiania; three volumes on Poland, from 1772 to 1914, by Dr. Otto Forst-Battaglia of Vienna; for France (1848-1914), four volumes, by Professor Paul Darmstädter of Göttingen; for Italy after 1300, and for Venice from 1200 to 1500, volumes by Professor Alfred Doren of Leipzig and H. Kretschmayr of Vienna, respectively. Dr. Alexius Ivič, archivist of Agram, will continue Jireček's *Geschichte der Serben*. Professor Godée Molsbergen of Batavia will prepare two volumes on the history of South Africa. Among plans respecting the history of the New World, we note that Professor Ernst Daenell of Münster expects to bring out in 1921 the first (1660-1775) of his volumes on the history of the United States; and that there will be volumes on the history of Canada by Professor Adolf Hasenclever, on the discovery of America by Captain Dr. Friederici, on Mexico by Professor Eduard Seler, on Central America by Professor Karl Sapper, on the West Indies by Dr. Wahrhold Drascher, and on Brazil by Professor Hermann Wätjen.

The Congress of Spanish-American History and Geography held at Seville in 1914 appointed a committee to arrange for a further congress two years later, but this was rendered impracticable by the war. It is now proposed to hold the congress early in 1921 in connection with the Spanish-American exposition at Seville. The programme contemplates four sections: on pre-Spanish America; on the history of America; on the geography of America; and on the history and geography of the Philippines, commemorative of the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the archipelago. Papers are to be presented in Spanish and should be submitted to the committee not later than December 31, 1920.

Number 17 of the *Proceedings* of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland (1919), presents the discussions which took place at the meeting held at Trénton and at Philadelphia, in the one case of the History Teacher and the League of Nations, in the other of History Teaching as Propaganda in dealing with After-War Problems: its Use and Abuse.

A committee of which M. Édouard Driault, editor of the *Revue des Études Napoléoniennes*, is chairman, is making elaborate preparations to commemorate, on May 5, 1921, the centenary of the death of Napoleon I. The committee proposes to organize Napoleonic exhibitions, lectures, visits to the battlefields of 1814, commemorative ceremonies, and an international historical congress. M. Driault's address is 3 Avenue Mirabeau, Versailles.

Ernest Seillière, a member of the Institute of France, has published during the past three years a series of three volumes: *Le Péril Mystique*

dans *l'Inspiration des Démocraties Contemporaines; Les Étapes du Mysticisme Passionnel, de Saint-Preux à Manfred*; and *Les Origines Romanesques de la Morale et de la Politique Romantiques* (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1918-1920). The volumes are marked by literary charm and undoubtedly form a masterly contribution to the history of literature, but their chief purpose and interest are in the elaboration of a new thesis in the philosophy of history. The author traces in literature from the days of ancient Greece to the present, especially in the writings of influential political thinkers, the erotic element. He finds that the increasing glorification of this element is closely linked with the growth of the democratic tradition. The conclusion is implicit that the present chaotic conditions are the natural fruit of these two parallel forces of evil. The conclusions are vigorously combatted by Professor Albert Mathiez in reviews of the first and third volumes in the *Annales Révolutionnaires* (July, 1918, pp. 564-566; March, 1920, pp. 162-163).

In Germany, too, novel philosophies of history are being evolved, as witness: *Individuum und Welt als Werk: eine Grundlegung der Kulturphilosophie* (Munich, Reinhardt, 1920, pp. 276), by G. Burckhardt; and *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umrisse einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*, vol. I., *Gestalt und Wirklichkeit* (Munich, Beck, 1919, pp. xv, 615); vol. II., *Welthistorische Perspektiven* (announced), by Oswald Spengler. A careful and extended review of the latter work by Rudolf Eisler will be found in the *Revue Politique Internationale* (January, 1920, pp. 81-102).

An interesting volume is *The History of the Art of Writing*, by W. A. Mason, director of art education in the Philadelphia Public Schools. The author traces the evolution of the art from the period of Egyptian hieroglyphics to the invention of the printing-press (Macmillan).

Students of military history will find that Marshal Foch's *Principles of War*, translated by Hilaire Belloc and published in this country by Messrs. Holt, is a substantial contribution to knowledge in their field.

The student of the history of the higher education in Europe will value a lecture on the history of the learned degrees, read last February before the Spanish Royal Academy of History by Dr. Eduardo Ibarra y Rodríguez of the University of Zaragoza, published with the title *Origen y Vicisitudes de los Titulos Profesionales en Europa, especialmente en España* (Madrid, Tip. Renovación).

The *Columbia University Oriental Studies* are soon to include part I. of *Moslem Schisms and Sects: being the History of Various Philosophical Systems developed in Islam*, by al-Baghdādī, translated from the Arabic by Dr. Kate C. Seelye.

*Jus Connatum and the Declaration of the Rights of Man*, by Julius Goebel (pp. 1-18), a reprint from vol. XIX. of the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, traces the history of the conception of "nat-



ural law" from the time of Greek thought to the period of greatest influence, at the close of the eighteenth century.

Messrs. Allen and Unwin announce a *History of Social Development*, a translation by Elizabeth C. Lake and H. A. Lake of the work of Dr. F. Muller-Lyer.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. H. Rivers, *History and Ethnology* (History, July); R. H. Murray, *The Idea of Progress* (Quarterly Review, July); F. Friedrich, *Versuch über die Perioden der Ideengeschichte der Neuzeit und ihr Verhältnis zur Gegenwart* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXII. 1); W. Bauer, *Das Schlagwort als Sozialpsychische und Geistesgeschichtliche Erscheinung* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXII. 2).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: J. A. Maynard, *A Second Bibliographical Survey of Assyriology, Years 1918-1919* (Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, March); T. Lenschau, *Bericht über Griechische Geschichte, 1907-1914* (Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, CLXXX.)

The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge has published *The Code of Hammurabi* and *Selections from the Tell-el-Amarna Letters*, ed. P. Handcock, and the first of six volumes of *The Library of Photius*, abounding in information concerning lost classics, and now translated for the first time into a modern language, by J. H. Freese.

*The Hittites*, by A. E. Cowley, sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library (Oxford University Press), illustrated, is composed of the Schweich Lectures delivered before the British Academy in 1918.

A new series of *Fontes Historiae Religionum ex Auctoribus Graecis et Latinis* has been initiated by Professor Carl Clemen with a volume of *Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1920).

In *Early Judaism*, a forthcoming volume from the Cambridge University Press, L. E. Browne, fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, attempts to show the relation between the failure of Judaism and the political and religious doctrines prevalent in the sixth and fifth centuries B. C.

Of *Das Antike Mysterienwesen in Religionsgeschichtlicher, Ethnologischer, und Psychologischer Beleuchtung*, by K. H. E. de Jong, a second edition has appeared (Leiden, Brill, 1920, pp. viii, 448), thoroughly revised and considerably enlarged.

The well-known Danish-Jewish writer, Georg Brandes, has issued the first volume of a study of the career of *Cajus Julius Caesar* (Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1920, pp. 540).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Hein, *Sumerer und Indogermanen* (Mannus, XI. 1); R. von Pohlmann, *Des Attischen Reiches Herr-*

lichkeit und Untergang (Lehren der Geschichte, XVII. 6); E. Karne-  
mann, *Philipp II. und Alexander der Grosse* (Internationale Monats-  
schrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik, November); G. Costa,  
*Politica e Religione nell' Impero Romano* (Rivista Italiana di Sociologia,  
July, 1919); E. G. Sihler, *In the Era of Diocletian* (Biblical Review,  
April); G. Ferrero, *La Ruine de la Civilisation Antique*, III. (Revue des  
Deux Mondes, June 1); G. Wilke, *Ueber den Beginn der Bronzezeit in  
Mitteleuropa* (Mannus, XI. 1); H. Peake, *The Finnic Question and  
some Baltic Problems* (Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute, July,  
1919).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

St. Optatus and the early Donatist writers are dealt with by Paul  
Monceaux in the fifth volume of his *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique  
Chrétienne depuis les Origines jusqu'à l'Invasion Arabe* (Paris, Leroux,  
1920, pp. 350).

*Christian Monasticism in Egypt to the Close of the Fourth Century*,  
by W. H. Mackean, is to be published this autumn by the Society for the  
Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which has also published a transla-  
tion into English of the *Ethiopic Didascalia*, useful for the history of the  
early Church, with introduction and notes by Dr. J. M. Harden.

Mr. Oscar D. Watkins, in *A History of Penance* (Longmans, 2  
vols.), accompanies his historical exposition with the text of the original  
authorities on whom he relies, discussions of their importance, and gen-  
eral summaries of the results of his investigations, which relate to the  
whole Church down to A. D. 450 and to the Western Church from 450  
to 1215.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Causse, *Essai sur le Conflit du  
Christianisme Primitif et de la Civilisation* (Revue de l'Histoire des  
Religions, March); L. M. A. Haughwout, *Steps in the Organization of  
the Early Church* (Anglican Theological Review, May).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Theodore Haarhoff's *Schools of Gaul* (Oxford University Press) is  
indicated by its subtitle as a study of pagan and Christian education in  
the last century of the Western Empire.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Herzfeld, *Das Strafverfahren  
Gregors VII. im Lichte der Ideen Augustins und Gregors I.* (Historische  
Vierteljahrschrift, XXVII. 3); Canon A. T. Bannister, *Church Life in  
the Later Middle Age* (Edinburgh Review, July); P. Guilhiermoz, *Re-  
marques Diverses sur les Poids et Mesures du Moyen Age* (Bibliothèque  
de l'École des Chartes, LXXX.).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

For the *Histoire Universelle du Travail*, Professor G. Renard and G.  
Weulersse have written *Le Travail dans l'Europe Moderne* (Paris,  
Alcan, 1920, pp. 524).

W. Mitscherlich, whose earlier study, published in *Schmoller's Jahrbuch* prior to the war, was a pioneer work on the subject, has now published a more extended study of *Der Nationalismus Westeuropas* (Leipzig, Hirschfeld, 1920, pp. xv, 374).

*Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, by Henry Osborn Taylor, a scholarly survey of the period of the Renaissance, is announced by the Macmillan Company for October publication.

The Görresgesellschaft has added two new volumes to its collection of materials on the Council of Trent, *Acta ad præparandum Concilium et Sessiones anni 1562 a prima (XVII) ad sextam (XXII)*, ed. Stephan Ehses, and the *Epistulæ*, ed. G. Buschbell, from March 5, 1545, to March 11, 1547 (Freiburg i. B., Herder).

Abbé A. Leman has recently published a volume on *Urbain VIII. et la Rivalité de la France et de la Maison d'Autriche de 1631 à 1635* (Paris, 1920); and Dr. Rosario Russo has ready for press an elaborate work, based on a wide variety of archival materials, on the history of the Holy See during the Swedish period of the Thirty Years' War.

Mr. A. Weiner, lecturer in history, Kings College, University of London, has compiled a collection of *Select Passages illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia* (pp. 76) which is published by the Macmillan Company.

From vol. VIII. of the *Proceedings* of the British Academy a careful paper by Lieut.-Col. F. De Filippi on *The Relations of the House of Savoy with the Court of England* has been reprinted and may be obtained from the Oxford University Press.

For early publication Messrs. Longman announce what promises to be an interesting social study, *The Relations of French and English Society, 1763-1793*, by C. H. Lockitt.

Professor E. Hubert of Liège has edited a volume of *Dépêches Inédites, 5 Janvier-23 Septembre 1792, de Mercy-Argenteau et Blumendorf* (Brussels, Lebègue, 1919, pp. 219). These reports of Blumendorf, the Austrian agent in Paris, to Count Mercy at Brussels have already been utilized to a considerable extent in the works of Glagau and Count Pimodan. A volume on the relations of *Austria e Piemonte nel 1793* (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1918, pp. xvi, 154) is by G. De Antonio.

A vivacious account of European society at the beginning of the nineteenth century may be found in *An Irish Peer on the Continent, 1801-1803*, edited by Thomas U. Sadleir (Williams and Norgate), a collection of letters written by Miss Catherine Wilmot, a young woman who accompanied Lord and Lady MountCashell on a Continental tour in the years mentioned.

C. Depuis has made a valuable contribution to the diplomatic history of 1814 in *Le Ministère de Talleyrand en 1814* (Paris, Plon, 1919, pp.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—II.

409). Fortunately much of his archival research had been completed prior to 1914.

The work of S. Baron on *Die Judenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress* (Vienna, Löwit, 1920, pp. 211) is based in part on unpublished materials. More recent events are covered in *Notes on the Diplomatic History of the Jewish Question* (London, Jewish Historical Society of England, 1919, pp. x, 133), which contains pertinent extracts from treaties and other official documents compiled by L. Wolf.

The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs has resumed the publication of *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870-1871*, which was interrupted by the war. The eleventh volume (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1920) covers the period from July 1 to August 6, 1866, thus including the preliminaries of Nikolsburg. Professor F. Oetker has written for the general reader *Die Emser Depesche, ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre rechtlich Politische Bedeutung* (Würzburg, Kabitzzsch and Mönnich, 1920).

*My Diaries: being a Personal Record of Events, 1888-1914*, by Wilfred S. Blunt (London, Marvin Secker, 2 vols., 1919, 1920), sets forth a view of the war as an Eastern war, a view which is the result of the writer's interest in Africa and Asia rather than in Europe.

*Die Internationale 1914 bis 1919* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1919), by R. Fester, includes a survey of the first International (1864-1876) and of the second International from its foundation in 1899. The volume is the first of a series on *Das Ausland im Weltkriege*.

The Oxford University Press has brought out *The Declaration of London, February 26, 1909: a Collection of Official Papers and Documents*, edited by James B. Scott, with an introduction by Elihu Root; also *Treaties for the Advancement of Peace between the United States and other Powers, negotiated by William J. Bryan*, with an introduction by Dr. Scott.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Edward Armstrong, *Machiavelli as a Political Thinker* (History, July); E. Griselle, *La Maison d'Autriche et la Politique Française au Traité de Westphalie, Notes Diplomatiques rédigées après l'Année 1652* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIII. 2); F. Kaphahn, *1648 und 1919: ein Historischer Vergleich* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XV. 2); H. Zwingmann, *Johann de Witt und Ludwig XIV., 1663* (Historische Vierteljahrsschrift, XXVII. 2); E. Wertheimer, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Deutsch-Oesterreichisch-Ungarischen Bündnisses von 1879* (Deutsche Rundschau, March); Rear-Admiral Degouy, *L'Escaut et le Rhin* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1); F. Wieser, *Die Revolutionen der Gegenwart* (Deutsche Rundschau, March); J. Lescure, *Le Mouvement Ouvrier depuis l'Armistice jusqu'en Mars 1920* (Revue d'Économie Politique, May); H. A. Gibbons, *The San Remo Conference* (Century, September).

## THE GREAT WAR

The London *Times* has just published the last number of *The "Times" History of the War*, of which the first number was issued in August, 1914. The whole work consists of twenty-one volumes, covering all phases of the war in so far as they could be covered in narratives nearly contemporaneous. The illustrations are of extraordinary variety and value.

Messrs. Hutchinson of London will publish, in two illustrated volumes, as a companion to Field-Marshal Ludendorff's *War Memories*, a work entitled *The General Staff and its Problems: the Secret History of the Relations between the High Command and the German Imperial Government as revealed by Official Documents*.

General H. von Kuhl, chief of the General Staff of the German first army, later in charge of Crown Prince Rupprecht, has published *Der Deutsche Generalstab in Vorbereitung und Durchführung des Weltkrieges* (Berlin, Mittler, 1920), in which he defends the General Staff against the charges of driving the country into war and of undervaluing the strength of their opponents. He allocates the responsibilities to England, France, and Russia. Of especial interest is the emphasis which he places on the work of Moltke's successors at the head of the General Staff, especially of Schlieffen. Another work on the period is by Richard Wolff on *Die Deutsche Regierung und der Kriegsausbruch: eine Darstellung auf Grund der Amtlichen Deutschen Vorkriegsakten* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1919). H. Martin has also written *Die Schuld am Weltkrieg* (Leipzig, Grunow, 1920).

Discussions of propaganda in the war are contained in *Les Chefs d'Oeuvre de la Propagande Allemande* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1920, pp. 280) by G. Drouilly and E. Guérinon; in *L'Offensive Morale des Allemands en France pendant la Guerre, l'Assaut de l'Âme Française* (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1920, pp. 360) by L. Marchand; and in *Nachrichtendienst, Presse, und Volksstimmung im Weltkrieg* (Berlin, Mittler, 1920) by Nicolai.

General Lanrezac, who in August, 1914, commanded the French Fifth Army, immediately on the right of the British Expeditionary Force, now publishes a clear historical account of its operations supported by orders, instructions, reports of conversations, etc., and presents a skillful criticism of the French plan of campaign, in a volume entitled *Le Plan de Campagne Français et le Premier Mois de Guerre* (Paris, Payot).

Mr. George H. Perris's *The Battle of the Marne* (London, Methuen) is an account by a war correspondent who was at the French general headquarters during two years of the war; it is based on many French and English sources.

The fifth volume of General Palat's *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental* (Paris, Chapelot) is entitled *La Retraite sur la Seine*, and

carries its very competent narrative and criticism from August 24 to September 4, 1914.

Messrs. E. P. Dutton and Company are the American publishers of *Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches, December 1915-April 1919*, official communications to the British government, on whose historical importance it is unnecessary to dwell.

Professor Gilbert Murray's *Our Great War and the Great War of the Ancient Greeks* (London, Thomas Seltzer) carries the analogy between the two periods of history of which he writes even to the personalities involved.

Contributions on the Belgian phase of the war are contained in B. Schwertfeger's *Belgische Landesverteidigung und Bürgerwacht (Garde Civique), 1914* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1920); O. Nippold's *Die Verletzung der Neutralität Luxemburgs und Belgiens* (Zurich, Orell Füssli, 1920, pp. iii, 114); F. Quiroga, *Les Allemands en Belgique, 1914-1918* (Paris, Belin, 1919, pp. 382); R. Henning's *Les Déportations de Civils Belges en Allemagne et dans le Nord de la France* (Brussels, Vromant, 1919); and in J. Schmitz and R. Nieuwland's *Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Invasion Allemande dans les Provinces de Namur et de Luxembourg* (Brussels, Van Oest, 1919, pp. 182), which is the first volume of a series. This volume relates only to events in August, 1914, and is a collection of accounts by eye-witnesses, reports, and depositions as well as a record of the contemporary observations of the authors.

General Malleterre has written a concise summary of the history of the war in *De Sarajevo à Versailles, Toute la Guerre Illustrée en un Volume* (Paris, Lafitte, 1920, pp. 240), which contains an extraordinary number of illustrations. A list of all engagements with date, place, and units engaged, with a list of all generals commanding in chief, has been issued by the German General Staff under the title *Die Schlachten und Gefechte des Grossen Krieges, 1914-1918* (Berlin, Sack, 1920, pp. 420). The eighth volume of A. Gauvain's *L'Europe au Jour le Jour* (Paris, Bossard, 1920, pp. 480) carries the narrative forward to November, 1915. Louis Madelin has brought out in book form his articles on *La Bataille de France de 1918* (Paris, Plon, 1920, pp. 380) which first appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. G. Guillon, a member of the 415th infantry regiment in General Gouraud's army, is the author of *La Poursuite Victorieuse, 26 Septembre-11 Novembre 1918* (Paris, Payot, 1919, pp. 256).

The *Mémoires* (Paris, Payot, 1920) and the *Mémoires, Défense de Paris* (*ibid.*) of General Galliéni have been published. The manuscript of the latter was written by his own hand in June, 1915. Marius and Ary Leblond have published *Galliéni Parle: Entretiens du "Sauveur de Paris", Ministre de Guerre, avec ses Secrétaires* (Paris, Albin Michel, 1920, 2 vols.). A volume on *Sarrail et Galliéni* (Paris, Fournier, 1919)

is by General Percin. General Sarraill has written *Mon Commandement en Orient, 1916-1918* (Paris, Flammarion, 1920, pp. 424), and General Dubail, *Quatre Années de Commandement, 1914-1918* (vol. I., Paris, Fournier, 1920, pp. 310).

Mention has been made in earlier issues of the *Review* of the discussion in progress in France over the conduct of the war by the French high command. Continuations of this debate are found in J. Bardoux's *La Marche à la Guerre, Deux Devoirs, Deux Tranchées* (Paris, Alcan, 1920, pp. 345); General Percin's *1914: les Erreurs du Haut Commandement* (Paris, Albin Michel, 1920), which is the first volume of a proposed series; \* \* \* 's *Le Plan XVII., Étude Stratégique* (Paris, Payot, 1920); Abel Ferry's *La Guerre Vue d'en Bas et d'en Haut* (Paris, Grasset, 1920), which bears the legend "L'Ame de 1793 est en bas: la Bureaucratie est en haut"; Capt. R. Recouly's *La Bataille de Foch* (Paris, Hachette, 1920), which uses Foch papers to describe the final campaign from the point of view of headquarters; and Mermeix's *Le Commandement Unique* (vol. I., Paris, Ollendorff, 1920, pp. 270). Together these volumes make no small contribution to the history of the conduct of the war from the French side.

The similar discussion in progress in Germany has also received notice. One of the more recent items therein is *Kritik des Weltkrieges: das Erbe Moltkes und Schlieffens im Grossen Kriege, von einem Generalstäbler* (Leipzig, Kohler, 1920, pp. xi, 246). General von Auffenberg-Komárow, quondam Austro-Hungarian war minister, and later commander of the fourth army in Galicia, has published *Aus Oesterreich-Ungarns Teilnahme am Weltkriege* (Berlin, Ullstein, 1920, pp. 393), which is, however, mainly devoted to his military command. One of the most interesting revelations was bound to be that of General Liman von Sanders which he has published under the title *Fünf Jahre in Türkei* (Berlin, Scherl, 1920). Naturally the interest of the volume is primarily political rather than military.

Eastern phases of the war are described in *La Campagne des Dardanelles: Documents Diplomatiques et Carnet de Campagne* (Paris, Chiron, 1920, pp. iv, 175) by X. Torau-Bayle; *La Victoire des Alliés en Orient, 15 Septembre-13 Novembre 1918* (Paris, Plon, 1920, pp. 252), by C. Photiadès; and *The Desert Campaigns* (London, Constable, 1918) and *How Jerusalem was Won* (*ibid.*, 1919) by W. T. Massey, the official correspondent of the London papers, whose thrilling narrative is to be completed in a third volume.

Rear-Admiral Daveluy has begun a study of *L'Action Maritime pendant la Guerre Anti-Germanique* (vol. I., Paris, Challamel). P. Ardoïn is the author of *L'Escadre Allemande du Pacifique* (*ibid.*) and of *L'Emden, ses Croisières et sa Fin* (*ibid.*). The wide range of topics involved is systematically surveyed in *Notre Marine Marchande pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Payot, 1920, pp. 384).



The applications of the Treaty of Versailles are studied by J. Godart in *Les Clauses du Travail dans le Traité de Versailles, 28 Juin 1919: les Décisions de la Conférence de Washington, November 1919* (Paris, Dunod, 1920, pp. 229); by H. Poeschel in *Die Kolonialfrage im Frieden von Versailles, Dokumente zu ihrer Behandlung* (Berlin, Mittler, 1920, pp. xii, 246); by Dukagin-Zadeh Basri Bey in *Le Monde Oriental et l'Avenir de la Paix* (Paris, Perrin, 1920, pp. xxxvi, 214); and by A. Gérard in *L'Extrême Orient et la Paix* (Paris, Payot, 1919, pp. 224).

A welcome publication is the *Atlas Universel de Géographie conformé aux Traités de Paix de 1919 et 1920* (Paris, Hachette), edited by F. Schrader under the auspices of the French Ministry of War. The work will comprise twenty-six parts issued in the loose-leaf form. The first part appeared in June and it is intended to complete the work by the close of 1921. The price, including index and binder, is fixed for advance subscribers at 240 francs.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Fester, *Verantwortlichkeiten* (Deutsche Rundschau, May, June); Capt. C. Delvert, *L'Offensive du 16 Avril 1917: Déposition d'un Témoin* (Revue de Paris, May 1); Maj. R. C. Cotton, *A Study of the St. Mihiel Offensive* (Infantry Journal, July); General Mangin, *Comment Finit la Guerre*, III-VI. (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 15, June 1, 15, July 1); XXX, *La Fin d'un Légende: la Mission du Maréchal Foch en Italie, Octobre-Novembre 1917* (*ibid.*, July 15); A. F. Pollard, *The Navy in the War* (Quarterly Review, July); Rear-Admiral Degouy, *Ludendorff et la Marine* (Revue de Paris, May 15); G. E. Mitchell, *The Rout of the Turks by Allenby's Cavalry*, II. (Cavalry Journal, July); General Dupont, *Une Mission en Allemagne: le Rapatriement des Prisonniers* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1).

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Under the editorship of H. Clive Barnard, various writers have contributed to the *Expansion of the Anglo-Saxon Nations* (Macmillan), a volume whose intent is to depict the spread of English-speaking peoples throughout the world. The résumé of American history is done by Professor L. P. Gipson of Wabash College.

Mr. John Murray will publish in the autumn an additional volume of Professor Baldwin Brown's *Arts in Early England*, dealing exhaustively with the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses, their runic inscriptions, the Gospels of Lindisfarne, etc.

In a volume entitled *King Alfred's Books*, prepared by Bishop Browne, and published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, the attempt is made, by descriptions and specimens, to show the character of the six books which the king translated or caused to be translated from Latin into English for the benefit of his people.

The Oxford University Press has published in advance, for the

British Academy, a paper from volume IX. of its *Proceedings*, on *Early English Magic and Medicine* (pp. 34), by Dr. Charles Singer.

Volume IV. of the *Records of Social and Economic History* published by the British Academy consists of a *Terrier of Fleet*, edited by Miss N. Neilson, and an *Eleventh Century Inquisition*, by the late Adolphus Ballard (Humphrey Milford).

*The Worcester Liber Albus: Glimpses of Life in a Great Benedictine Monastery in the Fourteenth Century*, consisting of correspondence of the prior, 1301-1338, edited by the Rev. Canon James M. Wilson, vicar-dean of Worcester, is a recent and valuable publication of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

*The Lollard Bible and other Medieval Biblical Versions*, by Miss Margaret Deanesly (Cambridge University Press), is a learned and important book, which sustains the view that both the two English fourteenth-century translations of the Bible originated from (early) Wycliffite circles, and also discusses with learning the general history of the medieval translations of the Vulgate and the attitude of authority toward their use, more especially by the laity.

The Oxford University Press has in preparation, in the series of *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies*, a *History of the Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries from the Earliest Times up to the Industrial Revolution*, by Herbert Heaton. In the Manchester University series, Messrs. Longmans have published *A Study of the Early English Cotton Industry*, by George W. Daniels, senior lecturer in economics in that university, and author of an article in that field which was printed in our twenty-first volume.

J. E. Gillespie is the author of a monograph entitled *The Influence of Oversea Expansion on England to 1700*, which is no. 207 of the *Columbia Studies*.

The thesis maintained by Miss Alice Clark in her *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London, George Routledge) is that, owing to her lack of specialized training, woman with the increasing importance of capital in industry sank to a less important position in the industrial world than she formerly held.

*The Great Fire of London in 1666*, by Walter G. Bell, which Mr. John Lane announces among the autumn books, is based on a wide study of manuscript sources and is illustrated by many contemporary drawings and plans.

In *Samuel Pepys and the Royal Navy* (pp. 84), the Lees Knowles Lectures delivered at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1919, Dr. J. R. Tanner presents the conclusions concerning the administration of the navy from the Restoration to the Revolution, at which he has arrived through a study of the Pepys manuscripts.

In an ingenious and convincing essay based on the careful study of a large body of material, C. H. Firth elucidates *The Political Significance of Gulliver's Travels* in a reprint from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy, vol. IX. (pp. 23).

The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge publishes this autumn *Some Eighteenth-Century Churchmen: Glimpses of English Church Life in the Eighteenth Century*, by G. Lacey May.

*A History of the Adams Family of North Staffordshire*, by P. W. L. Adams (London, St. Catherine Press), is of interest chiefly because of its many sidelights on the development of the pottery industry in England, with which successive generations of the family have been concerned.

A volume of great interest because of the social and political connections of Lady Williams Wynn is the *Correspondence of Charlotte Grenville, Lady Williams Wynn, and her Three Sons, Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, 5th Bart., Rt. Hon. Charles Williams Wynn, Sir Henry Williams Wynn, K.C.B., 1795-1832*, edited by Rachel Leighton (John Murray).

A documented *History of the Chartist Movement*, by the late Julius West, based on the collections of Francis Place and other fresh material, is published this autumn by Messrs. Constable.

No. 98 in the *Home University Library* published by Messrs. Holt is Professor Ernest Barker's *Political Thought in England from Herbert Spencer to the Present Day*, a rare piece of condensation and balanced judgment.

*A Life of Arthur James Balfour*, by E. T. Raymond, to be published this autumn by Little, Brown, and Company, can scarcely fail to be of great interest to students of modern history.

Mr. G. P. Gooch's *Life of Lord Courtney* (London, Macmillan) is the record of an unusual character and career, illustrating well the manner in which a man of great ability, well-known integrity, and complete independence of party, may in the House of Lords serve his own generation and be an inspiration to younger men.

An important subject is dealt with in F. E. Green's *History of the English Agricultural Labourer, 1870-1920* (London, P. S. King), and it is therefore the more to be regretted that the work has been done in the manner of a partisan rather than in that of an historian.

Mr. Basil Williams is now engaged on a life of Cecil Rhodes, which it is hoped will appear this autumn in the series *Makers of the Nineteenth Century* (Constable).

Mr. William Henry Jones, librarian and director of the Royal Institution of South Wales, has published vol. I. (earliest times to the fourteenth century) of a *History of Swansca and of the Lordship of Gower* (Carmarthen, W. Spurrell and Son, pp. xix, 347).

The July number of the *Scottish Historical Review* has a paper on Dunstaffnage Castle by J. R. N. Macphail, and one by Sir James Balfour Paul on Social Life in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century, as shown by data in the "protocol books" of the period.

Dr. James MacKinnon has recently published a readable *Social and Industrial History of Scotland* (Blackie).

An illustrated study, the result of much diligent research, of *Domestic Life in Scotland, 1488-1688*, by John Warrack, is a forthcoming volume of Messrs. Methuen.

In a brief essay entitled *Ireland the Outpost*, by Grenville A. J. Cole (Oxford University Press, pp. 78), the author shows the close connection between the physical structure of Ireland and her history and present situation. The study makes no attempt at continuous history but presents those events of the past which best illustrate the argument of the essay.

*Evening Memories*, by William O'Brien (Dublin, Maunsel) is chiefly a contribution, and an important one, to the history, from 1883 to 1890, of the Irish Nationalist party, in which Mr. O'Brien was a principal figure.

The Parliamentary Library of the Commonwealth of Australia has issued volume XII. (pp. xvii, 911) of *Historical Records of Australia: Governors' Despatches to and from England*, covering the period from June, 1825, to December, 1826.

British government publications: *Calendar of Close Rolls, Richard II.*, vol. II., 1381-1385.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Senior, *The Rise of the College of Advocates* (Law Quarterly Review, April); W. S. Holdsworth, *Press Control and Copyright in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Yale Law Journal, June); G. Davies, *Macpherson and the Nairne Papers* (English Historical Review, July); Conyers Read, *The Political Progress of the English Workingman*, I., II. (Journal of Political Economy, June, July); Viscount Esher, *Lord Beaconsfield* (Quarterly Review, July); W. Muss-Arnolt, *The Scottish Service Book of 1637 and its Successors* (American Journal of Theology, July); J. G. S. MacNeill, *The Irish Secretaryship and its Vicissitudes* (Fortnightly Review, July); Y. M. Goblet, *L'Évolution Politique Irlandaise de 1914 à 1920* (Revue de Paris, May).

#### FRANCE

General review: H. Hauser, *Histoire de France, Époque Moderne, 1494-1662* (Revue Historique, March).

In 1903 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs published the first volume of an *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives du Département des Affaires Étrangères, Correspondance Politique*. The second volume (Paris, Imp.

Nationale, 1919, pp. 772), devoted entirely to Spain, has recently been issued.

Professor Ernest Lavisse has undertaken to edit a continuation of his excellent *Histoire de France Illustrée*. The new work will bear the title, *Histoire de France Contemporaine, de la Révolution de 1789 aux Traités de 1919*, and will appear in ten volumes from October, 1920, to July, 1921 (Paris, Hachette). In the first volume Professor Sagnac will deal with the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; in the second and third Professor Pariset will cover the Convention and the Directory, the Consulate and the Empire; the fourth volume, on the Restoration, will be by S. Charlety, rector of the Academy of Strasbourg, who will also write the fifth, on the July Monarchy; Professor Seignobos will do the sixth (1848-1859), seventh (1859-1875), and eighth (1875-1914) volumes; the ninth volume, on the Great War, will be contributed by Henry Bidou and A. Gauvain; the indexes will form the tenth volume. It is peculiarly unfortunate that the period which particularly needs elucidation in such a work, that from 1875 to 1914, should be limited to a single volume. It is to be hoped that, even thus late, the plan will be changed so as to give at least two volumes to this period of forty years, nearly one-third of the whole cycle covered by the proposed series.

A useful one-volume *History of France from the Earliest Times to the Treaty of Versailles*, by W. S. Davis, has been published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

A. Castaing has prepared an *Histoire Générale des Alpes Françaises des Origines jusqu'à nos Jours* (Toulon, Imp. Jeanne d'Arc, 1919).

M. Bierbaum has made a study of *Bettelorden und Weltgeistlichkeit an der Universität Paris, Texte und Untersuchungen zum Literarischen Armuts- und Exemptionsstreit des 13. Jahrhunderts, 1255-1272* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1920).

From the number of excellent studies relating to the Reformation in France the following may be cited: A. Autin, *L'Échec de la Réforme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Contribution à l'Histoire du Sentiment Religieux* (Paris, Colin, 1918, pp. vii, 286); Mlle. L. Guiraud, *La Réforme à Montpellier* (Montpellier, Imp. Générale du Midi, 1918, 2 vols., pp. vii, 816; vii, 658); and V. Chareton, *La Réforme et les Guerres Civiles en Vivarais, 1544-1632* (Paris, Catin, 1920, pp. xii, 432).

The completion of V. L. Bourrilly and F. Vindry's edition of the *Mémoires de Martin et Guillaume du Bellay* (Paris, Société de l'Histoire de France, 1919, vol. IV.) furnishes the only narrative source covering the whole period of the reign of Francis I. P. Bonnefon has also completed his edition of the *Mémoires de Louis-Henri de Loménie, Comte de Brienne, dit le Jeune Brienne* (vol. III., *ibid.*). The final volume contains the writer's recollections of the king, the ministers, and other important personages, and the editor's biographical essay on Brienne.

The *Supplément à la Correspondance du Cardinal de Retz* (Paris, Hachette, 1920) has been re-edited with introduction and notes by the late C. Cochin for the *Collection des Grands Écrivains de la France*. The historical importance of the volume is considerable.

*Lettres inédites à Marie-Louise de Gonzague, Reine de Pologne, sur la Cour de Louis XIV. (1660-1667)*, with an introduction by M. Émile Magne (Paris, Émile-Paul) consists of letters from Condé and his son, touching upon a wide range of French affairs, public and private.

A volume of *Lettres Inédites du Roi Stanislas, Duc de Lorraine et de Bar, à Jacques Hulin, son Ministre en Cour de France, 1733-1766* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1920, pp. 141), has been edited by Dr. P. Boye.

Two noteworthy biographical studies for the revolutionary period are E. Welvert's *Le Secret de Barnave: Barnave et Marie Antoinette* (Paris, Boccard, 1920, pp. xii, 192) and E. Lintilhac's *Vergniaud* (Paris, Hachette, 1920).

The names of more than 4000 priests from fifty-one departments appear in *La Déportation du Clergé Orthodoxe pendant la Révolution, Registres des Ecclésiastiques Insermentés Embarqués dans les Principaux Ports de France, Août 1792-Mars 1793* (Paris, Catin, 1920, pp. xxx, 286), which has been patiently compiled by E. Sevestre, X. Eude, and E. Le Corbeillier. The scope and precision of the work make it a significant contribution to the history of the question.

Probably no more complete investigation of recruiting of the army in the revolutionary period has been made than by Capt. de Cardenal in *Recrutement de l'Armée en Périgord pendant la Période Révolutionnaire, 1789-1800* (Paris, Catin, 1920, pp. iv, 532).

The reminiscences of A. Moreau de Jonnès throughout the Napoleonic era have been translated into English by Brig.-Gen. A. J. Abdy under the title *Adventures in Wars of the Republic and Consulate* (John Murray).

*La Crise Sociale de 1848, les Origines et la Révolution de Février* (Paris, Hachette, 1920) was written by Dr. P. Quentin-Bauchart, who fell in the fighting on the Somme.

*Memoirs of the Empress Eugénie*, by Count Fleury (Appleton, 2 vols.), which has appeared since the death of the Empress, was prepared for publication many years ago, but at her desire was withheld from the public until after her death. There is also soon to appear from the press of Messrs. Cassell *Recollections of the Empress Eugénie*, by Augustin Filon, at one time private secretary to the empress.

The diplomatic history of the years from 1870 to 1914 receives critical examination in M. Christian Schefer's *D'Une Guerre à l'Autre*, though the author himself says that it is still too early for the definitive history of the diplomacy of that period to be produced.

General Lyautey's *Lettres du Tonkin et de Madagascar, 1894-1899* (Paris, Colin, 1920, 2 vols.) merit attention not merely because of the eminence attained by their author but also because of their intrinsic worth.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Madelin, *L'Histoire de la Nation Française* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1); R. L. Poole, *The Masters of the Schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time* (English Historical Review, July); F. Aubert, *Les Sources de la Procédure au Parlement au XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, III., concl. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, LXXX.); F. Wieser, *Die Französische Revolution* (Deutsche Rundschau, April); G. Lenotre, *Le Roi Louis XVII.*, VII.-VIII. (Revue des Deux Mondes: May 15, June 1); A. Mathiez, *Robespierre Terroriste* (Annales Révolutionnaires, May); H. Javal, *Les Variations de Cours des Rentes Françaises de 1798 à 1918* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, January); L. Dugas, *La Timidité de Waldeck-Rousseau* (Annales de Bretagne, XXXIV. 1).

#### ITALY AND SPAIN

A survey of the several groups of Capitoline archives is afforded by L. Guasco's *L'Archivio Storico del Comune di Roma* (Rome, Tip. Cugliani, 1919, pp. 108).

Mrs. George M. Trevelyan (daughter of Mrs. Humphry Ward) has written *con amore* a fresh and sympathetic treatment of Italian history for the general reader, *A Short History of the Italian People* (New York, Putnam).

The Istituto Storico Italiano will shortly publish vol. I. of the *Chronicon Vulturnense*, ed. V. Federici, and the *Cronaca di Benedetto di S. Andrea del Soratte*, ed. G. Zucchetti. It has in preparation vol. III. of the *Annali Genovesi*, ed. Marchese Imperiale, vol. IV. of the *Capitolari delle Arti Veneziane*, ed. G. Monticolo and E. Besta, the *Diplomi di Ugo e di Lotario*, ed. L. Schiaparelli, the *Anecdota* of Procopius, ed. D. Comparetti and D. Bassi, the *Codice Diplomatico Longobardo*, ed. L. Schiaparelli, and the *Cronaca di Fra Salimbene*, ed. P. Boselli. It has also resolved upon a *Codex Topographicus Urbis Romae*, upon a design of very large scope, to be executed under the editorial care of G. Zucchetti.

The new prefect of the Vatican archives, Cardinal Gasquet, and the sub-archivist, Mgr. Ugolini, have lately enlarged the hall of studies, added a new apartment for the school of palaeography, and caused a rearrangement of the materials for the period 1795-1818.

Cardinal Gasquet has just published (Longmans, 1920) a *History of the Venerable English College, Rome*, prepared for the celebration of the centenary of the reopening of the college in 1818, a celebration postponed by the circumstances of the times. In a sense, the story begins



with the Schola Anglorum of the eighth century, and there are documents from the fourteenth, but the cardinal's sketch relates chiefly to the college established in 1578, suppressed in 1773, and reopened in 1818.

An excellent study of Mazzini's ideals and their influence is found in *Mazzini* by Gaetano Salvemini (Rome, *La Voce*, London, Truslove and Hanson); a series of letters so intimate as to partake of the nature of an autobiography is comprised in *Mazzini's Letters to an English Family*, edited by E. F. Richards (Lane).

*Note di Guerra*, vol. I., by Gen. Luigi Capello (Milan, Fratelli Treves), is the beginning of an important contribution to the history of the war from the Italian point of view, and extends from the opening of hostilities to the capture of Gorizia.

E. Varagnac has utilized to considerable extent his articles printed in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* following Castelar's death, in his volume, *Un Grand Espagnol Apôtre du Droit des Peuples, Emilio Castelar* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1920, pp. 328).

Don Gabriel Maura Gamazo, Conde de Mortera, has published the first volume of a *Historia Crítica del Reinado de Don Alfonso XIII. durante su Menoridad* (Barcelona, Montaner y Simon), treating with great ability and interest the important years from 1885 to 1898, including the approach to the war with the United States. The author has special advantages in being the son of Don Antonio Maura, minister of the colonies, and nephew of Señor Gamazo, finance minister, in the Sagasta cabinet.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Falco, *I Comuni della Campagna e della Marittima nel Medio Evo* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XLII. 3-4); S. Reinach, *La Bossue d'Assise et la Conversion de Saint-François* (Revue Historique, March); A. Anzilotti, *Cenni sulle Finanze del Patrimonio di S. Pietro in Tuscia nel Secolo XV.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XLII. 3-4); G. Prato, *La Lotta contro il Comunismo Fondiario nel Piemonte di Carlo Alberto* (La Riforma Sociale, May); E. Mayor des Planches, *Re Vittorio Emanuele II. alla Vigilia della Guerra del Settanta, con Documenti Inediti* (Nuova Antologia, April 16); L. Barrau-Dihigo, *Étude sur les Actes des Rois Asturiens, 718-910* (Revue Hispanique, June, 1919); R. Costes, *Pedro Mexia, Chroniste de Charles-Quint* (Bulletin Hispanique, XXII. 1); anon., *Spain's Position in Morocco* (Fortnightly Review, July).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

*Die Bistumserrichtung in Deutschland im Achten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, Enke, 1920, pp. vii, 259), by H. Notlarp, involves the extension of Frankish rule as well as of Christian teaching into German lands.

*Ulrich von Hutten und die Reformation: eine Kritische Geschichte*

einer wichtigsten Lebenszeit und der Entscheidungsjahre der Reformation, 1517-1523 (Leipzig, Haupt, 1920, pp. xv, 601) is from the competent pen of P. Kalkoff, as is also *Erasmus, Luther, und Friedrich der Weise, eine Reformationsgeschichtliche Studie* (Leipzig, Haupt, 1920, pp. xviii, 113). A double number, the third and fourth for 1919, of *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* appears as a second "Lutherheft". Its contents naturally deal chiefly with theological questions but include Luthers Eintritt ins Kloster by E. Hirsch and Die Berichte über Luthers Tod, im Anschluss an Schubarts Sammlung, by O. Albrecht.

The most recent issue of *Württembergische Landtagsakten* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1920, pp. xlvi, 863) covers the years 1608-1620 and is edited by A. E. Adam.

*Der Pietismus des 18. Jahrhunderts in den Hannoverschen Stammländern* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1919, pp. ii, 206) is a monograph by R. Ruprecht.

F. Rosenzweig has devoted two volumes to the consideration of *Hegel und der Staat* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1920).

H. Rothfels has made a contribution to the history of the traditions of the General Staff in *Karl von Clausewitz, Politik und Krieg, eine Ideengeschichtliche Studie* (Berlin, Dümmler, 1920).

A. Calmes has made an exhaustive study of *Der Zollanschluss des Grossherzogtums Luxemburg an Deutschland, 1842-1918* (2 vols., Frankfurt, Baer, 1920, pp. 268, 252).

F. Lassalle's *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften* (Berlin, Cassirer, 1919) have been published in five volumes, while Professor H. Oncken has written *Lassalle: eine Politische Biographie* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1920), and G. Bernstein, *Ferdinand Lassalle, eine Würdigung des Lehrers und Kämpfers* (Berlin, Cassirer, 1920, pp. 309). A biography of *Friedrich Engels* (Berlin, Springer, 1920) is by G. Mayer.

A translation of the third volume of Bismarck's autobiography, entitled *The Kaiser versus Bismarck*, is soon to be published by the house of Harper, with an introduction by Professor Charles D. Hazen.

H. Plehn has made a useful contribution by his volume on *Bismarcks Auswärtige Politik nach der Reichsgründung* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1920, pp. xii, 381). Unpublished memoranda by the Chancellor's subordinates Boetticher and Rottenburg have been utilized by Georg, Freiherr von Eppstein, in his volume on *Fürst Bismarcks Entlassung* (Berlin, Scherl, 1920, pp. 237).

Hermann, Freiherr von Eckardstein's *Lebenerinnerungen und Politische Denkwürdigkeiten* (Leipzig, List, 1919-1920, 2 vols.), contain, especially in the second volume, materials on international affairs, particularly Anglo-German relations since about 1899.

A recent issue of *International Conciliation* embodies *German Secret War Documents*, covering the period from June 15 to August 5, 1914, published by the German government in 1919.

Messrs. Skeffington of London have published under the title *The Guilt of William Hohenzollern*, an English translation of the small volume, *Wie der Weltkrieg entstand*, written by Karl Kautsky after his examination of the archives of the German Foreign Office.

Count Brockdorff-Rantzau has brought together in a volume entitled simply *Dokumente* (Charlottenburg, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte) the notes addressed by him as German foreign secretary to the allied governments at Versailles, his speeches, interviews, and other documents intended to exhibit the foreign policy of the new Germany during his brief tenure of office.

Arthur Dix has undertaken to analyze the causes of Germany's collapse in 1918 in *Wirtschaftskrieg und Kriegswirtschaft, zur Geschichte des Deutschen Zusammenbruchs* (Berlin, Mittler, 1920, pp. vi, 369). The story of *Das Erste Jahr der Deutschen Revolution* (Leipzig, Munir, 1920) is told by E. Scheiding. P. Gentizon has recorded observations during considerable periods of residence in Munich, Weimar, and Berlin in *L'Allemagne en République* (Paris, Payot, 1920). Dr. A. Got undertakes to expose the German militarists in *La Contre-Révolution Allemande* (Strasbourg, Imp. Strasbourgeoise, 1920). A. Röder has written of *Der Deutsche Konservatismus und die Revolution* (Gotha, Perthes, 1920, pp. viii, 133).

A defensive pamphlet of considerable importance is August Demblin's *Czernin und die Sixtus-Affaire* (Munich, Drei Masken Verlag, 1920, pp. 102), with an appendix of eighteen documents.

*Les Faubourgs de Genève au XV<sup>me</sup> Siècle* (Geneva, Jullien, 1919, pp. x, 155) by Louis Blondel is published as the fifth volume of the quarto series of *Mémoires et Documents publiés par la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*. The author has prepared a concise, well-written account, historical and descriptive, based upon thorough and extensive researches, of the several suburbs prior to their demolition as a measure of military security between 1530 and 1540. Two appendixes furnish a list of the suburban property-holders and other information based on cadastral lists of 1477, which may be used in connection with the accessible records to trace the transmission of any parcel of land from that time to the present. Two large colored maps supplement this information with the utmost clearness and precision of detail. The work is obviously of more than local antiquarian interest and is a valuable contribution to the history of European towns.

There have recently come to hand parts 3-6 of vol. IV. of the *Bulletin* of the same society, containing its proceedings from November, 1915, to May, 1919, inclusive. In addition to summaries of papers pre-

sented and notes on publications, part 3 has a body of letters of J. G. Eynard on Greece, 1841-1843; part 4, a paper by M. Charles Martin on the Stafford family at Geneva and its conflict with Calvin, 1536; part 5, an account of the society's manuscripts. The society has also issued a *Mémorial des Années 1888 à 1913*, surveying its activities during the third quarter-century of its existence, with indexes, and containing the proceedings of the seventy-fifth anniversary session.

M. Pierre Grellet's *Les Aventures de Casanova en Suisse: la Vie et les Moeurs au XVIII<sup>me</sup> Siècle d'après des Documents Nouveaux* (Lausanne, *Spes*), is much more than a mere contribution to the biography of a picturesque scoundrel. It depicts with great skill and with minute care the details of life in Switzerland in 1760.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. von Bezold, *Ein Antisimonistisches Gelübde König Heinrichs I.* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXVII. 2); F. Güterbock, *Neuere Forschungen zur Geschichte Heinrichs des Löwen* (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, March 6); Dr. Schornbaum, *Die Bündnisbestrebungen der Deutschen Evangelischen Fürsten und Markgraf Georg Friedrich von Brandenburg-Ansbach, 1566-1570*, I. (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXVIII. 2); W. Andreas, *Marwitz und der Staat Friedrichs des Grossen* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXII. 1.); L. Bergsträsser, *Kritische Studien zur Konfliktzeit* [Prussia, 1862-1866] (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXVII. 3); A. D., *L'Armée Allemande de 1871 à 1918* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, June); J. Rovère, *L'Opinion et la Vie Politique en Bavière de 1871 à 1914* (*ibid.*); H. Delbrück, *Kaiser und Kanzler* (Preussische Jahrbücher, April); E. H. Starling, *The Food Supply of Germany during the War* (Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, March); Theodore von Sosenosky, *The Emperor Francis Joseph as Statesman* (Fortnightly Review, July); R. J. Kerner, *Austro-Hungarian War Aims in the Winter of 1915-1916 as revealed by Secret Documents* (Journal of International Relations, April).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

A contemporary history of the Netherlands of real merit has been provided by N. Japikse in his *Staatkundige Geschiedenis van Nederland van 1887-1917* (Leiden, Sijthoff, 1920, pp. 556).

A. de Ridder of the Belgian foreign office is the author of *La Belgique et la Prusse en Conflit, Histoire des Relations Prusso-Belges de 1835 à 1839* (Brussels, Vromant, 1920, pp. 168) and of *Le Traité de 1839, Histoire Diplomatique du Traité du 19 Avril 1839* (*ibid.*, pp. 400).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: A. Ganem, *Histoire de Suède, 1903-1915* (Revue Historique, March).

Dr. Mary W. Williams, in *Social Scandinavia in the Viking Age*, has presented a picture which ranges from the physical environment of the people to the clothes they wore, their manners, and their government.

No. 25 of the *Helps for Students of History* (London, S. P. C. K.), is an *Introduction to the Study of Russian History* by W. F. Reddaway, a useful book for the beginner in the subject.

A biographical memoir of Suvorov, by W. Lyon Please, will shortly be published by Messrs. Constable.

*Les Fondateurs de Neige* (Brussels and Paris, Van Oest et Cie.) is a body of notes on the Bolshevik revolution at Petrograd during the winter of 1917-1918, by M. Jules Destrée, a member of the Belgian Chamber of Deputies, who at that time represented Belgium with the Russian provisional government.

Marc Vichniac, who was secretary of the constituent assembly, has furnished an excellent study of the soviet system in *Le Régime Soviétiste, Étude Juridique et Politique* (Paris, Povolozky, 1920, pp. 103). A Russian revolutionary socialist, D. Ganonsky, has attacked the Bolshevik rule from its own documents in *Le Bilan du Bolchevisme Russe* (*ibid.*, pp. 104). T. Szablinski, a Polish officer, has given his recollections in *De l'Aigle Noir à l'Aigle Blanc* (Paris, Naert, 1920).

*Russian-American Relations, March, 1917-March, 1920*, is a body of documents and papers edited for the League of Free Nations Association by C. K. Cumming and Walter W. Pettit (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Howe).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: O. Halecki, *L'Union de Lublin, à l'Occasion de son 350<sup>e</sup> Anniversaire* (*Revue Historique*, March); Alexander Iswolsky, *The First Douma* (*Fortnightly Review*, July); V. Zenzinoff, *La Carrière d'un Révolutionnaire Russe* (*Revue de Paris*, April 15, May 15).

#### SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

W. E. D. Allen's *The Turks in Europe* (Scribner) is a study of Turkish incapacity throughout their history.

Messrs. Allen and Unwin have added to the stream of volumes on the Near East *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle* by M. Edith Durham, and *Serbia and Europe, 1914-1918*, written by various Serbian publicists.

The *Memoirs of Ismail Kemal Bey*, edited by Sommerville Story (Constable), is a volume of recollections of a statesman, much of whose life has been devoted to the cause of Albania.

The Turkish entry into the war and the Dardanelles campaign are the main topics in *Turcs et Turquie* (Paris, Payot, 1920) by Capt. H. Seignobosc, who was a French agent in the East.

*Venizelos*, by Herbert Adams Gibbons, inaugurates a new series of  
AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVI.—12.

biographies of modern statesmen to be published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: William Miller, *The Venetian Revival in Greece, 1648-1718* (English Historical Review, July); H. A. Gibbons, *Venizelos and Hellas* (Century Magazine, July).

#### ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

*India at the Death of Akbar*, by W. H. Moreland (London, Macmillan), is a solid account of the economic situation of the country at the beginning of the seventeenth century, intended to supply a basis on which other students may build the economic history of the ensuing 300 years.

Indian economic history, phases of which have of late been the subject of various monographs, is to receive a useful addition in *British Beginnings in Western India, 1579-1667: an Account of the Early Days of the British Factory of Surat*, by H. G. Rawlinson (Oxford University Press). A study with a somewhat broader range is *Trade Relations between England and India, 1600-1896*, by C. J. Hamilton (Calcutta, Thacker, Spink, and Company).

*Dupleix et l'Inde Française*, by Alfred Martineau (Paris, Champion), is the first of three volumes on the subject of the French in India which the author plans. The present volume is written with much knowledge and skill.

*India's Demand for Transportation*, by Dr. William E. Weld (Columbia Studies, vol. XC., no. 2), though not history, has several chapters of historical interest. A brief sketch of early waterways and roads of India is followed by a more detailed study of the growth of railroads and a valuable examination of the effect of these roads on the economic development of India.

*One Hundred Years of Singapore*, an account of this capital from its foundation by Sir Stamford Raffles in 1819, has been prepared by several authors under the direction of W. Makepeace, editor of the *Singapore Free Press*, Dr. G. E. Brooke, port health officer of Singapore, and R. St. J. Braddell, advocate and solicitor of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlement. It is announced among the forthcoming books of John Murray.

The George H. Doran Company has for early publication a *History of the Japanese People*, by Capt. F. Brinkley, long recognized as an authority on all Japanese matters, and Baron Kikushi.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. H. Rowbotham, *The Jesuits at the Court of Peking* (Chinese Social and Political Science Review, December); A. Martineau, *Dupleix* (Revue d'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, 1920, I.); Hilda D. Oakley, *Sir Alfred Lyall and Indian Prob-*

lems (Quarterly Review, July); M. Spronck, *La Perse et l'Accord Anglo-Persan* (Revue Hebdomadaire, May 29).

### AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

*The Gold Coast and the War*, by Sir Charles Lucas, an installment of a projected work on the *Empire at War*, has been issued by the Oxford University Press.

Dr. Seitz, the last governor of German Southwest Africa, has embodied his knowledge of conditions there in *Süd-Afrika im Weltkriege* (Berlin, D. Reimer).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Kann, *La Pacification du Maroc* (Revue de Paris, June 1).

### AMERICA

#### GENERAL ITEMS

The Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress has recently acquired the manuscript of a large part of the *Personal Memoirs* of General Grant, with many notes and memoranda, all in his own hand; thirty-one letters of President Cleveland to Rear-Admiral Evans, 1894-1904; a body of personal reminiscences of Rear-Admiral George C. Remey, 1841-1903, with especial sections relating to the blockade of Charleston, S. C., 1863; a record of expenditures and correspondence of the Treasury Department of the Confederacy, 1861-1864, and quartermaster's correspondence, 1861-1864; typewritten copies of more than 200 letters of Andrew Jackson to John Coffee and others, from 1804 to 1845; papers of Justice Benjamin Robbins Curtis, 1831-1878; and many letters and papers of Senator Joseph R. Hawley of Connecticut.

Harper and Brothers have published *The United States: an Experiment in Democracy*, by Professor Carl Becker, soon to be reviewed in this journal.

Mr. William Smith, of the Public Archives of Canada, formerly of the Canadian postal service, is soon to publish through the Cambridge University Press a *History of the Post Office in British North America, 1639-1870*.

The major portion of the *Journal of Negro History* for July is devoted to a study of 'Slavery in Canada' by Justice William R. Riddell of the Supreme Court of Ontario (pp. 261-377). The author finds evidence of slaves in Canada as early as 1628 and follows the history of slavery in that country from that time to the beginning of the nineteenth century. His work is largely based on manuscripts in the Canadian archives.

From lectures which the author delivered to units of the American Army of Occupation in Germany in 1919, Mr. J. Travis Mills has pro-



duced a readable study on *Great Britain and the United States: a Critical Review of their Historical Relations* (Oxford University Press, pp. 65). With the avowed purpose of fostering amicable relations between the two countries, Mr. Mills emphasizes those phases of the common history which can be made to serve that end and which he believes have been neglected in the teaching of history in this country. Among other topics, he discusses the mercantilist philosophy of England and its effect on colonial government, the part played by the West in the War of 1812, England's position during the Civil War and in the Venezuelan dispute.

The Century Company announces among its forthcoming books *Sea Power in American History*, by Herman E. Krafft and Walter B. Norris, both of the faculty of the United States Naval Academy.

*Political Summary of the United States, 1789-1920*, by Ernest F. Clymer (Dutton), is a slender reference book, containing the briefest of biographies of our presidents, histories of our political parties, past and present, and the popular and the electoral vote at each of our presidential elections.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for April, 1919, contains a paper by Professor A. B. Hulbert, on the Increasing Debt of History to Science; some eighty pages of papers of Aaron Burr, contributed by Mr. W. C. Ford; and the Ohio section of Mr. Brigham's Bibliography of American Newspapers. The Burr papers, many of which are letters to Burr, of the Revolutionary and later periods, were given as autographs to a Massachusetts lady by Matthew L. Davis, to whom we are in a sense indebted for their preservation, and unfortunately also for the destruction of nearly all the rest of a collection which would have been invaluable.

Professor J. Laurence Laughlin's *Banking Progress* (Scribners) treats of the developments in American banking from the time when the "Baltimore plan" was first proposed in 1894 to the workings of the Federal Reserve system at the present date.

Dr. W. L. Windlass has embodied in his *United States Department of Agriculture: a Study in Administration* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, series XXXVIII., no. 1) a useful sketch of the history of the department.

It is understood that a feature of the commemoration next year of the hundredth anniversary of Amherst College will be the publication of a number of "Amherst Books". Among these will be a volume by the late Professor Anson D. Morse, entitled *Parties and Party Leaders*. It will be published by the Marshall Jones Company.

The July number of the *Catholic Historical Review* has three principal articles: one on the Franciscan Exploration of California, by Dr. Herbert I. Priestley; one on the Beginnings of the Church in Little Rock, by Rev. F. G. Holweck; and a biographical article on Archbishop

John B. Purcell of Cincinnati, by Sister Mary Agnes McCann, Ph.D. The documentary section is a long and valuable exposition, by the editor, Professor Guilday, of the course of events which led to the appointment of Father John Carroll as prefect-apostolic of the Catholic Church in the new republic of the United States, 1783-1785, a contribution which will be of interest to many students of that period of our history.

Rev. Patrick W. Browne of Newfoundland, formerly professor of history in the University of Ottawa, is preparing for publication Jean Dilhet's *L'État d'Église Catholique ou du Diocèse des États-Unis d'Amérique Septentrionale*. Father Delhet was in the United States from 1798 to 1807. The manuscript of his survey, a source of considerable value, is in the possession of the Sulpician Fathers of Baltimore.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

*In the Days of the Pilgrim Fathers*, by Mary C. Crawford (Little, Brown, and Company), *The Women who came in the Mayflower*, by Annie R. Marble (Pilgrim Press), *Old Plymouth Trails*, by Winthrop Packard (Small, Maynard, and Company), and *Old Coast Roads from Boston to Plymouth*, by Agnes E. Rothery (Houghton Mifflin Company), are among the books to which the *Mayflower* tercentenary lends a special interest.

Professor A. Eekhof of Leiden has just published, in facsimile, in transcript, and in English translation, *Three Unknown Documents concerning the Pilgrim Fathers in Holland* (the Hague, Nijhoff). One bears the personal signature of John Robinson, another that of William Bradford, written just before leaving Leiden for America, while the third is the last will of Bridget Robinson, the pastor's widow.

Among recent Spanish publications we note a substantial volume by Señor Manuel Conrotte on *La Intervención de España en la Independencia de los Estados Unidos de la América del Norte* (Madrid, Victoriano Suarez).

The voluminous writings of the Adams family are soon to furnish material for another interesting volume, *A Cycle of Adams Letters*, consisting of letters of Charles Francis Adams, Charles Francis Adams, jr., and Henry Adams, during the Civil War. The collection is to be edited by W. C. Ford, and published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dr. W. E. Barton, a Kentucky clergyman, has in his painstaking study, *The Soul of Abraham Lincoln* (Doran), made good use of his knowledge of the environment in which Lincoln's early years were spent.

*The Lutheran Church and the Civil War*, by Charles W. Heathcote, is from the press of Revell.

*Ulysses S. Grant: his Life and Character*, by Hamlin Garland, is announced by the Macmillan Company for early publication.

Mr. Charles C. Taylor, late British vice-consul at New York, is preparing for publication by John Murray *The Life of Admiral Mahan*, in which he dwells especially upon the development of Admiral Mahan's books on sea-power and of their influence on the world.

Among forthcoming biographies is a promising one by E. S. Martin, *The Life of Joseph Hodges Choate*, to be published by Messrs. Scribner.

An *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie* is announced as among the forthcoming books of the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Joseph B. Bishop's two-volume *Theodore Roosevelt and his Times* it is hoped will appear this autumn from the press of Messrs. Scribner.

#### THE UNITED STATES IN THE GREAT WAR

*The Final Report of Gen. John J. Pershing, Commander-in-Chief of American Expeditionary Forces* (pp. 96, seven maps, H. Doc. 626) has been twice reprinted, and can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents for 85 cents.

We have received vols. II. and III. of a compilation called *Soldiers of the Great War* (Washington, Soldiers Record Publishing Association) without having received vol. I., which probably explains the scope and method of the compilation. Its interest to the historian will apparently lie solely in the fact that the three volumes contain photographs of some 20,000, and lists of some 60,000 soldiers of the Great War, grouped by states. It will be possible for future inquirers to glean from these pages a vivid notion of the actual composition of the American army of 1917 and 1918.

George Creel has brought out through Harper and Brothers an account of the organization and accomplishments of the Committee of Public Information. The book is entitled *How We Advertised America*. The same publisher also announces Mr. Creel's *The World, the War, and Wilson*.

From the Historical Branch, War Plans Division of the General Staff, several monographs have already appeared, among which are: a *Survey of German Tactics, 1918* (Monograph No. 1); and *Economic Mobilization in the United States* (Monograph No. 2).

#### LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

The *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* for July contains continuations of the Diary of Master Joseph Tate of Somersworth, N. H., and John Devereux of Marblehead, Mass., and Some of his Descendants.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has received from Mr. Frederic Winthrop a fund of ten thousand dollars, to be known as the Robert

Winthrop Fund. The income is to be used in publishing Winthrop papers of Massachusetts and Connecticut, including those possessed by the society. A beginning will soon be made, by editing and printing anew the seventeenth-century papers, heretofore printed, with the addition of others now available.

The main content of the July number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* is a continuation of F. B. C. Bradley's *Some Account of Steam Navigation in New England*. The number also continues the Documents relating to Marblehead, Mass.

The librarian of the Connecticut Historical Society reports in the last *Annual Report* of the society (May, 1920) that the society has published the second volume of the papers of Gov. Thomas Fitch. This report also contains a greatly condensed list of the manuscripts of the Hon. Henry S. Sanford, whose activities, both diplomatic and economic, cover a wide range of events. The society has received in this collection many thousand pieces, extending over the years 1784-1884.

Mr. Albert C. Bates of the Connecticut Historical Society has reprinted, in a very small edition, facsimiles of the exceedingly rare session laws of Connecticut during the period 1716-1749, filling the interval between the compilation of 1715 and that of 1750 (pp. 211-574). The few remaining sets are sold at \$350 each.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library continues in the June and July numbers its List of New York Almanacs, 1694-1850, pts. II. and III., and also its list of accessions relating to the "Great War and After".

The English translation of vol. I. of the Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange and the Village of Beverwyck, April 15, 1652-December 12, 1656, the work of Mr. A. J. F. van Laer, is now in the hands of the printer. This volume inaugurates a series of translations of Dutch records which the Division of Archives and History of the University of the State of New York plans to publish.

The *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* (June, 1920) contains among other things part I. of the Records of the Middle Association of Congregational Churches of the State of New York, 1806-1810, edited by the Rev. John Q. Adams, and an article entitled the Influence of Luther upon Manhattan Island during its Childhood Days, by the Rev. C. E. Corwin.

The contents of the July number of the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* include an article by J. Hall Pleasants on Francis Lovelace, Governor of New York, 1668-1673; one by Torstein Jahr on Andreas Dreyer (Andries Draeyer), commander at Fort Nassau (Al-

bany), 1673-1674, rear-admiral of the Dano-Norwegian navy; and the addresses delivered at a special meeting of the New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, April 10, 1920, called for the purpose of conferring honorary membership of the society upon the French ambassador to the United States, Monsieur Jusserand. The response of Ambassador Jusserand, which is principally concerned with Citizen Genet, is of especial interest.

The July number of the New York Historical Society's *Quarterly Bulletin* contains an historical account, by A. J. Wall, of the Statues of King George III. and of William Pitt, erected in New York City, 1770.

The May number of the *Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia* contains a sketch of President Isaac Sharpless (1848-1920), with a bibliography of his writings; a concluding installment of the Revolutionary Journal of Margaret Morris of Burlington, N. J.; and a portion of the private journal of Ellis Yarnall (1757-1847), giving an account of a visit to Friends in Charleston, S. C., in 1819.

A *History of Northampton County, Pennsylvania, and the Grand Valley of the Lehigh*, in three volumes, has been brought out in New York by a concern styling itself the American Historical Society.

In the issue of *Papers read before the Lancaster County Historical Society* for April 16 is an address by Hon. Frederick A. Goldcharles entitled the Influence of Lancaster County on the Pennsylvania Frontier. The same issue contains a summary of an address by Mr. Albert C. Myers entitled In Quest of William Penn.

The principal article in the July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* is by Hon. Edward E. Robbins, on the Life and Services of Colonel Henry Bouquet.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

In the June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* are found: an investigation of the Old Indian Road of Northern Maryland, by William B. Marye; a paper on the Royal Province of Maryland in 1692, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner; a continuation of the sketches, by McHenry Howard, of Some Early Colonial Marylanders, as also of Edward S. Delaplaine's Life of Thomas Johnson.

The archives section of the Virginia State Library has acquired a list of marriage bonds and licenses of Northampton County, 1706-1853, a photostat copy of a survey book of Prince George County, 1710-1724, and the journal of the James River Steamboat Company, 1833-1849.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* completes, in the issue for July and October (double number) its Roll of Honor: Virginians who have died in the War for Liberty. The letters of William Byrd, First, the Preston Papers, the Instructions to Lord Culpeper, and

the Minutes of the Council and General Court are continued. Among the Preston Papers are letters from Jefferson, William Fleming, William Christian, General Davidson, General Sumner, Col. William Campbell, Elijah Clarke, and others.

Philip A. Bruce in his *History of the University of Virginia*, 1819-1919, presents what almost amounts to a picture of the intellectual life of the South for a hundred years of its history (Macmillan).

The North Carolina Historical Commission has recently received the papers of George W. Swepson (438 pieces), bearing upon the history of reconstruction in North Carolina.

The *Proceedings* of the nineteenth annual session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina, November, 1919, have been published by the North Carolina Historical Commission. The volume is concerned almost entirely with papers on the World War, among which may be mentioned one by Professor Archibald Henderson on Contributions of North Carolina Women to the World War; Some Economic Events of the World War, by W. H. Glasson; and the Preservation of North Carolina's World War Records, by R. B. House.

In the January number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, under the title Early Letters from South Carolina upon Natural History, is a letter of Hannah Willams, written in 1705, and also three, written in 1709 and 1710, from Joseph Lord, pastor at Dorchester of a congregation of settlers from Dorchester, Mass.

A somewhat unusual record is contained in William Way's *History of the New England Society of Charleston, South Carolina, 1819-1919*, published by the society.

In the March number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* the chief articles are Oglethorpe's Treaty with the Lower Creek Indians, and a Eulogy on the Life and Character of Dr. Noble Wymberley Jones, by Dr. John Grimes.

The British Historical Manuscripts Commission has published, as volume I. of the manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont, the *Diary of Viscount Percival*, afterward first Earl of Egmont. This volume covers the years 1730-1733, and should yield much of interest to students interested in the founding of Georgia.

An excellent piece of historical work in the field of local history has been done by Miss Carita Doggett, in *Dr. Andrew Turnbull and the New Smyrna Colony of Florida* (Jacksonville, Drew Press), an account of an ambitious attempt at colonization in the middle of the eighteenth century.

A volume entitled *Louisianians and their State: an Historical and Biographical Text-Book of Louisiana, its Notable Men, and Leading Institutions* has been published in New Orleans by the Historical and Biographical Association.

## WESTERN STATES

The June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains the presidential address of M. M. Quaife, delivered at the thirteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, held at Greencastle, Ind., April 29, 1920, on Jonathan Carver and the Carver Land Grant. The journal also contains W. W. Carson's Transportation and Traffic on the Ohio and the Mississippi before the Steamboat, which was read at the twelfth annual meeting of the society, and an article by C. B. Coleman entitled the Ohio Valley in the Preliminaries of the War of 1812.

The January-June issue (double number) of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* is made up of selections from the military papers of Gen. John S. Gano (1766-1822). The papers in this selection, although the earliest is of 1797, pertain principally to the period from 1804 (when Gano was made major-general of Ohio militia) to 1812. Other selections from these papers are to appear in future issues of the *Quarterly*.

The issue of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for April is a memorial to Emilius O. Randall (1850-1919), secretary of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society from 1894 until his death in 1919. There are numerous addresses and appreciations.

The Illinois State Historical Library has issued *Illinois Constitutions*, edited by Emil J. Verlie. The volume constitutes vol. XIII. of the *Collections* of the Illinois State Historical Library, and vol. I. of the *Constitutional Series*. Besides the constitutions of 1818, 1848, and 1870, the volume contains the several preliminary instruments upon which the state organization rests, namely, the Ordinance of 1787, the acts of Congress of May 7, 1800, February 3, 1809, and April 18, 1818, and the ordinance of the Illinois convention of 1818, accepting the propositions of the United States embodied in the enabling act. There are also a table of cases and an index to the constitution of 1870.

The great collection of autographs formed by the late Charles F. Gunther, whom competent authority has described as "the greatest collector of historical documents and autograph letters in America", has been secured at a great price for the Chicago Historical Society. There are thought to be over 30,000 manuscripts. The character of the collection makes it impossible to summarize its contents in a note. It includes papers coming from most of our public men and illustrating all parts of our history. There is of course much that relates especially to the history of Illinois and Chicago, *e. g.*, the papers of Governor Ninian Edwards.

The July number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* contains an extended account, by Joseph J. Thompson, of the Double Jubilee celebrated in June, that is, the "Diamond" jubilee of the Chicago diocese



and the "Silver" jubilee of Archbishop Mundelein. There is a biographical sketch, by Rev. F. G. Holweck, of Rev. Gaspar H. Ostlangenberg (1810-1885), and the first installment of an account, by Rev. Francis J. Epstein, of the Leopoldine Association, the German-Austrian society for the propagation of the faith. There are also continued articles hitherto mentioned.

Among the articles in the January number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* are: Tennessee Scotch-Irish Ancestry, by Blanche Bentley; Some Early Archaeological Finds in Tennessee, by W. A. Provine; Why the First Settlers of Tennessee were from Virginia, by A. V. Goodpasture; and a continuation of the Journal of Governor John Sevier.

Among the papers in the January number of the *Michigan History Magazine* are: the University of Michigan and the Training of her Students for the War, by Professor Arthur L. Cross; Fort Gratiot and its Builder, General Charles Gratiot, by William L. Jenks; the Treaty of Saginaw, 1819, by Fred Dustin; Rise and Progress of Hope College, by Dr. Ame Vennema; the True Story of Edison's Childhood and Boyhood, by Caroline F. Ballentine; and a report of War Work of the Daughters of the American Revolution of Michigan from April, 1915, to April, 1919, by Mrs. William H. Wait. This number contains also the seventh annual report of the Michigan Historical Commission.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has added to its collections the papers of Jeremiah M. Rusk, during his service in Congress, his governorship of Wisconsin, and his work as Secretary of Agriculture. Much light is thrown on the politics of Wisconsin by these papers, especially those that fall within the years 1881-1888.

The June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* contains a continuation of the Story of Wisconsin, by Miss Louise P. Kellogg; Another View of the Kensington Rune Stone, by Rasmus B. Anderson; some account of Early Life in Southern Wisconsin, by David F. Sayre; a sketch of the Career of Edward F. Lewis, by Franklin F. Lewis; and a continuation of the papers of W. A. Titus concerning Historical Spots in Wisconsin. In the section of documents the Journal of Life in Wisconsin One Hundred Years Ago, kept by Willard Keyes of Newfane, Vt., is continued.

In the February number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* appears an address on American Democracy, delivered by Professor Carl R. Fish before the Minnesota Historical Society in January. To the same number Dr. Lewis H. Roddis contributes an account of the Last Indian Uprising in the United States, that at Leech Lake, Minn., in October, 1898. The May number contains a single article, a very interesting account, by George W. McCree, of his experience in Recruiting Engineers for the World War in Minnesota.

A journal covering the years 1827 to 1829, of Maj. Lawrence Taliaferro, Indian agent at Fort Snelling, has recently come to light and proves to be a missing number of the series of Taliaferro journals in the manuscript collection of the Minnesota Historical Society. The society has obtained a typewritten copy of the journal and expects ultimately to come into possession of the original.

The April number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains the journal of Maj. William Williams of a trip from Westmoreland County, Pa., to Iowa in 1849, and an account, by J. W. Cheney, of Rev. Daniel Lane and his Keosauqua Academy.

Professor Louis B. Schmidt contributes two papers in agricultural history to the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*: the one, Some Significant Aspects of the Agrarian Revolution in the United States, a study of the period from 1860 to 1890; the other, the Westward Movement of the Wheat-Growing Industry in the United States. Other articles in this number of the *Journal* are: the Soldier Vote in Iowa in the Election of 1888, by Donald L. McMurry; an Historical Survey of the Militia in Iowa, 1898-1916, by Cyril B. Upham; and Some Materials for the Study of Iowa Archaeology, by Charles R. Keyes.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has begun the publication of a new historical magazine, monthly, to be called the *Palimpsest*, the function of which is to present historical matter in briefer and less technical form than is appropriate to the pages of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*. The first number was that of July.

The Missouri Historical Society expects to issue early in October a volume entitled *The Journal of a Fur-Trading Expedition on the Upper Missouri, 1812-1813*, by John C. Luttig, clerk of the Missouri Fur Company. The society has recently received a number of muster- and pay-rolls of the Missouri regiments in the Confederate army.

In the July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* appears a paper, by William C. Binkley, on the Question of Texan Jurisdiction in New Mexico under the United States, 1848-1850. Mr. A. K. Christian's study of Mirabeau B. Lamar is continued.

The Wyoming Historical Society has issued a pamphlet of *Miscellanies* (Laramie, 1919, pp. 54) containing articles on the early newspapers of Wyoming, on the Wheatland Colony, and on the Lost Cabin mines.

*The Splendid Wayfaring*, by John G. Neihardt, recounts the adventures of Jedediah Smith and his companions in explorations between the Missouri River and the Pacific Ocean, 1822-1831 (Macmillan).

*The Bozeman Trail*, described in its subtitle as "Historical Accounts of the Blazing of the Overland Routes into the Northwest, and the

Fights with Red Cloud's Warriors", by Miss Grace R. Hebard, professor in the University of Wyoming, and E. A. Brininstool, has been published in two volumes by the Arthur H. Clark Company. The fascinating story is abundantly illustrated and handsomely printed.

The April number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* contains an article by Victor J. Farrar on the Reopening of the Russian-American Convention of 1824; one by William S. Holt, D. D., on the Beginning of Mission Work in Alaska by the Presbyterian Church; a journal of David Thompson's Journeys in Idaho in 1809, edited by T. C. Elliott; John Work's Journal of a Trip from Fort Colville to Fort Vancouver and Return in 1828; and continuations of Professor Meany's studies of the Origin of Washington Geographic Names and of the Nisqually Journal, edited by Victor J. Farrar. The July number presents an unusually interesting table of contents. Besides continuing the Nisqually Journal and Mr. Elliot's contribution, it presents: Letters on the Northwest Fur Trade, contributed by S. E. Morison; and Shipbuilding in the Pacific Northwest, by Helen D. Goodwin.

Articles in the March number of the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society are: a sketch of Pacific University, by Henry L. Bates; a paper on Spain and England's Quarrel over the Oregon Country, by Professor F. G. Young; and a study, by Herbert I. Priestley, of the Log of the *Princesa* by Estévan José Martínez. In the documentary section is a group of letters of the Rev. William M. Roberts, third superintendent of the Oregon mission, edited by Robert M. Gatke.

#### CANADA

The *Report of the Public Archives* of Canada for the year 1918 (pp. xvii, 208, 71, 87) indicates the receipt of large numbers of interesting transcripts from European archives, and presents texts, in French and English, of all the ordinances, proclamations, and similar public notices issued by the military governors of Quebec, Montreal, and Trois Rivières during the period of military government, 1759-1764; prints also the proclamations issued by the governor-in-chief of Canada from 1764 to 1791; and concludes the calendar of the Neilson papers.

*The Grey Nuns in the Far North, 1867-1917*, by Father P. Duchaussois, O. M. I. (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, pp. 287), is a record of devoted religious work among the Indians of the Northland at Fort Providence on the Mackenzie River, where the Grey Nuns established their convent in 1867. The opening chapters trace the story of the Grey Nuns from their founding at Montreal by Madame d'Youville in 1738 and the extension of their work in various directions.

#### AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The *Hispanic American Historical Review* for May has the following articles: the Ecclesiastical Policy of Francisco Morazan and the other

Central American Liberals, by Mary W. Williams; *El Derecho Consuetudinario y la Doctrina de los Juristas en la Formación del Derecho Indiano*, by Ricardo Levene; United States Shipping in the La Plata Region, 1809-1810, by Charles L. Chandler; and the Post-War Attitude of Hispanic America toward the United States, by W. E. Dunn.

Numbers 32-33 of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* contains the text of several geographical "relations" of Philip II.'s time, concerning towns in New Spain—Cuzcatlán, Cimapan, Tutenango, Tetela, and Hueyapan—with maps.

*La Religión del Imperio de los Incas*, by Don Jacinto Jijón y Caamaño (Quito, Tip. Salesianas, 1919, pp. 452), is a solid and important study based on careful research and useful to anthropologists and students of primitive religions.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. J. Powicke, *John Robinson and the Beginnings of the Pilgrim Movement* (Harvard Theological Review, July); A. Rein, *Die Historische Forschung über die Ursprünge der Verfassung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXII. 2); H. T. Stock, *A Résumé of Christian Missions among the American Indians* (American Journal of Theology, July); Elizabeth W. A. Pringle, *When Sherman's Army passed: being Chronicles of Chicora Wood*, I., II. (Scribner, July, August); W. A. Phillips, *The Senate and the Covenant* (Edinburgh Review, July); R. Escobar Lara, *The Monroe Doctrine and the League of Nations* (Inter-America, English, June); Col. H. A. Smith, *Four Interventions in Mexico: a Study in Military Government*, I.-II. (Infantry Journal, July, August); W. R. Shepherd, *The Caribbean Policy of the United States* (Journal of International Relations, July); G. Porras Troconis, *Las Ideas Constitucionales del Libertador en sus Primeros Años* (La Reforma Social, May); E. Quesada, *La Doctrina Drago, su Esencia y Concepto Amplio y Claro* [with bibliography] (Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, October).